arXiv:1609.06617v2 [math.ST] 22 Sep 2016

SMOOTHED ISOTONIC ESTIMATORS OF A MONOTONE BASELINE HAZARD IN THE COX MODEL

HENDRIK P. LOPUHAÄ AND ENI MUSTA
DELFT UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

Abstract. We consider the smoothed maximum likelihood estimator and the smoothed Grenander-type estimator for a monotone baseline hazard rate λ_0 in the Cox model. We analyze their asymptotic behavior and show that they are asymptotically normal at rate $n^{m/(2m+1)}$, when λ_0 is $m \geq 2$ times continuously differentiable, and that both estimators are asymptotically equivalent. Finally, we present numerical results on pointwise confidence intervals that illustrate the comparable behavior of the two methods.

1. Introduction

The semi-parametric Cox regression model is a very popular method in survival analysis that allows incorporation of covariates when studying lifetime distributions in the presence of right censored data. The ease of interpretation, resulting from the formulation in terms of the hazard rate as well as the proportional effect of the covariates, and the fact that the regression coefficients (parametric component) can be estimated while leaving the baseline distribution unspecified, favor the wide use of this framework, especially in medical applications. On the other hand, since its first introduction (see [5]), much effort has been spent on giving a firm mathematical basis to this approach. Initially, the attention was on the derivation of large sample properties of the maximum partial likelihood estimator of the regression coefficients and of the Breslow estimator for the cumulative baseline hazard (e.g., see [11], [6], [32]). Although the most attractive property of this approach is that it does not assume any fixed shape on the hazard curve, there are several cases where order restrictions better match the practical expectations (e.g., see [35] for an example of a decreasing hazard in a large clinical trial for patients with acute coronary syndrome). Estimation of the baseline hazard function under monotonicity constraints has been studied in [4] and [26].

Traditional isotonic estimators, such as maximum likelihood estimators and Grenander-type estimators are step functions that exhibit a non normal limit distribution at rate $n^{1/3}$. On the other hand, a long stream of research has shown that, if one is willing to assume more regularity on the function of interest, smooth estimators might be preferred to piecewise constant ones because they can be used to achieve a faster rate of convergence to

Delft Institute of Applied Mathematics, Mekelweg 4, 2628 CD Delft, The Netherlands
E-mail address: H.P.Lopuhaa@tudelft.nl, E.Musta@tudelft.nl.

Key words and phrases. isotonic estimation, hazard rate, kernel smoothing, asymptotic normality, Cox regression model, smoothed Grenander estimator, smoothed maximum likelihood estimator.

a Gaussian distributional law and to estimate derivatives. Isotonized smooth estimators, obtained either by a least squares projection, maximum likelihood, or penalization, are studied in [28], [30], [12], [33], and in [27], who also compares isotonized kernel estimators with smoothed isotonic estimators in the regression setting. Smoothed maximum likelihood estimators for monotone functions have also been investigated by [8], to bootstrap from a smooth decreasing density estimate, by [19] for the current status model, together with a maximum smoothed likelihood estimator, and by [16] for estimating a monotone hazard rate, together with a penalized least squares estimator. Other references for combining shape constraints and smoothness can be found in Chapter 8 in [17]. Distribution theory was first studied by [28], who established asymptotic normality for a kernel smoothed least squares regression estimator, but this result is limited to a rectangular kernel and the rate of convergence is slower than the usual rate for kernel estimators. In [33] it is shown that the isotonized kernel density estimator has the same limit normal distribution at the usual rate $n^{m/(2m+1)}$ as the ordinary kernel density estimator, when the density is m times continuously differentiable. Similar results were obtained by [19] for the smoothed maximum likelihood estimator and the maximum smoothed likelihood estimator, and by [16] for a smoothed Grenander-type estimator.

In [29], three smooth monotone estimators for a monotone hazard rate in the Cox model have been introduced, which were shown to be consistent. Then a natural question is whether these estimators exhibit a Gaussian limit distribution at the usual rate $n^{m/(2m+1)}$. The main interest of the present paper is to investigate the asymptotic behavior of two of such methods, the smoothed maximum likelihood estimator and a smoothed Grenander-type estimator. This is particularly challenging for the Cox model, because the existing approaches to these type of problems for smoothed isotonic estimators do not apply to the Cox model. The situation is different from isotonized smooth estimators, such as the maximum smoothed likelihood estimator and a Grenander-type estimator based on the smoothed Breslow estimator, which are studied in [24].

The smoothed Grenander-type estimator in the ordinary right censoring model without covariates was investigated by [23]. Following the approach in [16], asymptotic normality has been established by using a Kiefer-Wolfowitz type of result, recently derived in [10]. Unfortunately, the lack of a Kiefer-Wolfowitz type of result for the Breslow estimator provides a strong limitation towards extending the previous approach to the more general setting of the Cox model. Recently, [17] developed a different method for finding the limit distribution of smoothed isotonic estimators, which is mainly based on uniform L_2-bounds for the distance between the non-smoothed isotonic estimator and the true function, and also uses the maximal distance between succeeding points of jump of the isotonic estimator being of the order $O_p(n^{-1/3} \log n)$. A sketch of proof in the right censoring model is given in Section 11.6 of [17]. However, these two key ingredients heavily depend on having exponential bounds for tail probabilities of the so-called inverse process, or rely on a strong embedding for the relevant sum process. Exponential bounds for tail probabilities of the inverse process are difficult to obtain in the Cox model and a strong embedding for the Breslow estimator is not available. Nevertheless, inspired by the approach in [17], we obtain polynomial bounds, which will suffice for obtaining uniform L_2-bounds, and we

avoid using the maximal distance between succeeding points of jump of the non-smoothed isotonic estimator, by establishing a sufficiently small bound on the expected supremum distance between the non-smoothed isotonic estimator and the true baseline hazard.

This leads to asymptotic normality at rate $n^{m/(2m+1)}$ of the smoothed maximum likelihood estimator and the smoothed Grenander-type estimator, which are also shown to be asymptotically equivalent. By means of a small simulation we investigate the finite sample behavior in terms of asymptotic confidence intervals corresponding to the limit normal distributions, as well as pivotal bootstrap confidence intervals based on a smooth bootstrap proposed by [2] and [36]. As expected, no estimator performs strictly better than the other.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we specify the Cox regression model and provide some background information that will be used in the sequel. The kernel smoothed versions of the Grenander-type estimator and of the maximum likelihood estimator of a non-decreasing baseline hazard function are considered in Section 3. We only consider the case of a non-decreasing baseline hazard. The same results can be obtained similarly for a non-increasing hazard. In order to keep the exposition clear and simple, most of the proofs are delayed until Section 5, and remaining technicalities have been put in the Supplemental Material [25].

2. The Cox regression model

Let $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ be an i.i.d. sample representing the survival times of n individuals, which can be observed only on time intervals $[0, C_i]$ for some i.i.d. censoring times $C_1, \ldots, C_n$. One observes i.i.d. triplets $(T_1, \Delta_1, Z_1), \ldots, (T_n, \Delta_n, Z_n)$, where $T_i = \min(X_i, C_i)$ denotes the follow up time, $\Delta_i = \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i \leq C_i\}}$ is the censoring indicator and $Z_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is a time independent covariate vector. Given the covariate vector Z, the event time X and the censoring time C are assumed to be independent. Furthermore, conditionally on $Z = z$, the event time is assumed to be a nonnegative r.v. with an absolutely continuous distribution function $F(x|z)$ and density $f(x|z)$. Similarly the censoring time is assumed to be a nonnegative r.v. with an absolutely continuous distribution function $G(x|z)$ and density $g(x|z)$. The censoring mechanism is assumed to be non-informative, i.e. F and G share no parameters.

Let H and H^{uc} denote respectively the distribution function of the follow-up time and the sub-distribution function of the uncensored observations, i.e.,

$$H^{uc}(x) = \mathbb{P}(T \leq x, \Delta = 1) = \int \delta \mathbb{1}_{\{t \leq x\}} \, \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(t, \delta, z), \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbb{P}$ is the distribution of (T, Δ, Z). We also require the following assumptions, some of which are common in large sample studies of the Cox model (e.g. see [26]):

(A1) Let τ_F, τ_G and τ_H be the end points of the support of F, G and H. Then

$$\tau_H = \tau_G < \tau_F \leq \infty.$$

(A2) There exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{|\beta - \beta_0| \leq \epsilon} \mathbb{E}\left[|Z|^2 \, \mathrm{e}^{2\beta' Z} \right] < \infty.$$

(A3) There exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{|\beta-\beta_0|\leq\epsilon} \mathbb{E}\left[|Z|^2 \, \mathrm{e}^{4\beta' Z}\right] < \infty.$$

Let us briefly comment on these assumptions. While the first one tells us that, at the end of the study, there is at least one subject alive, the other two are somewhat hard to justify from a practical point of view. One can think of (A2) and (A3) as conditions on the boundedness of the second moment of the covariates, for β in a neighborhood of β_0.

Within the Cox model, the conditional hazard rate $\lambda(x|z)$ for a subject with covariate vector $z \in \mathbb{R}^p$, is related to the corresponding covariate by

$$\lambda(x|z) = \lambda_0(x) \, \mathrm{e}^{\beta_0' z}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^+,$$

where λ_0 represents the baseline hazard function, corresponding to a subject with $z = 0$, and $\beta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the vector of the regression coefficients.

By now, it seems to be rather a standard choice estimating β_0 by $\hat{\beta}_n$, the maximizer of the partial likelihood function, as proposed by [5]. The asymptotic behavior was first studied by [32]. We aim at estimating λ_0, subject to the constraint that it is increasing (the case of a decreasing hazard is analogous), on the basis of n observations $(T_1, \Delta_1, Z_1), \ldots, (T_n, \Delta_n, Z_n)$. We refer to the quantity

$$\Lambda_0(t) = \int_0^t \lambda_0(u) \, \mathrm{d}u,$$

as the cumulative baseline hazard and, by introducing

$$\Phi(x; \beta) = \int \mathbb{1}_{\{t \geq x\}} \, \mathrm{e}^{\beta' z} \, \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(t, \delta, z), \tag{2}$$

we have

$$\lambda_0(x) = \frac{h(x)}{\Phi(x; \beta_0)}, \tag{3}$$

where $h(x) = \mathrm{d}H^{uc}(x)/\mathrm{d}x$ (e.g., see (9) in [26]). For $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$, the function $\Phi(x; \beta)$ can be estimated by

$$\Phi_n(x; \beta) = \int \mathbb{1}_{\{t \geq x\}} \mathrm{e}^{\beta' z} \, \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_n(t, \delta, z), \tag{4}$$

where $\mathbb{P}_n$ is the empirical measure of the triplets (T_i, Δ_i, Z_i) with $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Moreover, in Lemma 4 of [26] it is shown that

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |\Phi_n(x; \beta_0) - \Phi(x; \beta_0)| = O_p(n^{-1/2}). \tag{5}$$

It will be often used throughout the paper that a stochastic bound of the same order holds also for the distance between the Breslow estimator

$$\Lambda_n(x) = \int \frac{\delta \mathbb{1}_{\{t \leq x\}}}{\Phi_n(t; \hat{\beta}_n)} \, \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_n(t, \delta, z). \tag{6}$$

of the cumulative hazard and Λ_0, but only on intervals staying away of the right boundary

$$\sup_{x\in[0,M]} |\Lambda_n(x) - \Lambda_0(x)| = O_p(n^{-1/2}), \qquad \text{for all } 0 < M < \tau_H, \tag{7}$$

(see Theorem 5 in [26]).

Smoothing is done by means of kernel functions. We will consider kernel functions k that are m-orthogonal, for some $m \geq 2$, which means that $\int k(u)u^j \,\mathrm{d}u = 0$, for $j = 1, \ldots, m-1$, and $\int |k(u)||u|^m \,\mathrm{d}u < \infty$. We assume that k has a bounded support $[-1, 1]$ and denote by k_b its scaled version $k_b(u) = b^{-1}k(u/b)$. Here $b = b_n$ is a bandwidth that depends on the sample size, in such a way that $0 < b_n \to 0$ and $nb_n \to \infty$, as $n \to \infty$. From now on, we will simply write b instead of b_n. Note that if $m > 2$, the kernel function k takes also negative values and as a result also the smooth estimators of the baseline hazard defined in (8) and (9) might be negative. To avoid this, one could restrict oneself to $m = 2$. In that case, the most common choice is to let k be a symmetric probability density.

3. Smoothed isotonic estimators

We consider smoothed versions of two isotonic estimators for λ_0, i.e, the maximum likelihood estimator $\hat{\lambda}_n$ and the Grenander-type estimator $\tilde{\lambda}_n$, introduced in [26]. The maximum likelihood estimator of a nondecreasing baseline hazard rate λ_0 can be characterized as the left derivative of the greatest convex minorant of the cumulative sum diagram defined in Lemma 1 in [26]. For a fixed $x \in [0, \tau_H]$, the smoothed maximum likelihood estimator $\hat{\lambda}_n^{SM}$ of a nondecreasing baseline hazard rate λ_0, was defined in [29] by

$$\hat{\lambda}_n^{SM}(x) = \int_{(x-b)\vee 0}^{(x+b)\wedge\tau_H} k_b(x-u)\,\hat{\lambda}_n(u)\,\mathrm{d}u. \tag{8}$$

The Grenander-type estimator $\tilde{\lambda}_n$ of a nondecreasing baseline hazard rate λ_0 is defined as the left hand slope of the greatest convex minorant (GCM) $\tilde{\Lambda}_n$ of the Breslow estimator Λ_n. For a fixed $x_0 \in [0, \tau_H]$, we consider the smoothed Grenander-type estimator $\tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG}$, which is defined by

$$\tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x) = \int_{(x-b)\vee 0}^{(x+b)\wedge\tau_H} k_b(x-u)\tilde{\lambda}_n(u)\,\mathrm{d}u. \tag{9}$$

Uniform strong consistency on compact intervals in the interior of the support $[\epsilon, M] \subset [0, \tau_H]$ is provided by Theorem 5.2 of [29],

$$\sup_{x\in[\epsilon,M]} \left|\tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x) - \lambda_0(x)\right| \to 0, \quad \text{with probability one.} \tag{10}$$

Strong pointwise consistency of $\hat{\lambda}_n^{SM}$ in the interior of the support is established in Theorem 5.1 in [29]. Under additional smoothness assumptions on λ_0, one can obtain uniform strong consistency for $\hat{\lambda}_n^{SM}$ similar to (10). Inconsistency at the boundaries is a frequently encountered problem in such situations and can be partially avoided by using a boundary corrected kernel. One possibility is to construct linear combinations of $k(u)$ and $uk(u)$ with coefficients depending on the value near the boundary (e.g., see [37], [8], or [23])



FIGURE 1. Left panel: The MLE (piecewise constant solid line) of the baseline hazard (dashed) together with the smoothed MLE (solid). Right panel: The Grenander estimator (piecewise constant solid line) of the baseline hazard (dashed) together with the smoothed Grenander estimator (solid).

Then, it can be proved, exactly as it is done in [23], that uniform consistency holds on $[0, M] \subset [0, \tau_H]$.

Figure 1 shows the smoothed maximum likelihood estimator (left) and the smoothed Grenander-type estimator (right) for a sample of size $n = 500$ from a Weibull baseline distribution with shape parameter 1.5 and scale 1. For simplicity, we assume that the real valued covariate and the censoring times are uniformly $(0, 1)$ distributed and we take $\beta_0 = 0.5$. We used a boundary corrected triweight kernel function $k(u) = (35/32)(1-u^2)^3 \mathbb{1}_{\{|u|\leq 1\}}$ and bandwidth $b = n^{-1/5}$.

In the remainder of this section we will derive the pointwise asymptotic distribution of both smoothed isotonic estimators, in (8) and (9). As already mentioned, our approach is inspired by techniques introduced in Section 11.6 of [17]. We briefly describe this approach for the smoothed Grenander estimator, for which the computations are more complicated. We start by writing

$$\tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x) = \int k_b(x-u)\,\mathrm{d}\Lambda_0(u) + \int k_b(x-u)\,\mathrm{d}(\tilde{\Lambda}_n - \Lambda_0)(u).$$

On an event E_n with probability tending to one, we will approximate

$$\int k_b(x-u)\,\mathrm{d}(\tilde{\Lambda}_n - \Lambda_0)(u) \tag{11}$$

by $\int \theta_{n,x}(u,\delta,z)\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(u,\delta,z)$, for some suitable function $\theta_{n,x}$ (see Lemma 3.1), whose piecewise constant modification $\overline{\theta}_{n,x}$ integrates to zero with respect to the empirical measure $\mathbb{P}_n$ (see Lemma 3.2). This enables us to approximate (11) by

$$\int \overline{\theta}_{n,x}(u,\delta,z)\,\mathrm{d}(\mathbb{P}_n-\mathbb{P})(u,\delta,z)+\int \big(\overline{\theta}_{n,x}(u,\delta,z)-\theta_{n,x}(u,\delta,z)\big)\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(u,\delta,z). \tag{12}$$

Then, the key step is to bound the second integral in (12) by means of L_2-bounds on the distance between the ordinary Grenander estimator and the true baseline hazard (see Lemma 3.3). The last step consists of replacing $\overline{\theta}_{n,x}$ by a deterministic function $\eta_{n,x}$ (see Lemma 3.4) and use empirical process theory to show that

$$\int \eta_{n,x}(u,\delta,z)\,\mathrm{d}(\mathbb{P}_n-\mathbb{P})(u,\delta,z)$$

is asymptotically normal.

Before we proceed to our first main result, we will formulate the steps described above in a series of lemmas. Let $x\in(0,\tau_H)$ and $0<M<\tau_H$. For n sufficiently large, such that $0<x-b<x+b<M$, define

$$a_{n,x}(u)=\frac{k_b(x-u)}{\Phi(u;\beta_0)},\quad \text{for } u\le x+b, \tag{13}$$

where $\Phi(u;\beta_0)$ is defined in (2), and $a_{n,x}(u)=0$ for $u>x+b$. We then have the following approximation for (11). The proof can be found in Section 5.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $a_{n,x}$ be defined by* (13) *and let $\hat{\beta}_n$ be the partial MLE for β_0. There exists an event E_n, with $\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\to 1$ in probability, such that for*

$$\theta_{n,x}(u,\delta,z)=\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left\{\delta\, a_{n,x}(u)-\mathrm{e}^{\hat{\beta}_n' z}\int_0^u a_{n,x}(v)\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{\Lambda}_n(v)\right\}, \tag{14}$$

it holds

$$\int \theta_{n,x}(u,\delta,z)\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(u,\delta,z)=-\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\int k_b(x-u)\,\mathrm{d}(\tilde{\Lambda}_n-\Lambda_0)(u)+O_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

Next, we consider a piecewise constant modification $\overline{a}_{n,x}\overline{\Phi}_n$ of $a_{n,x}\Phi_n$, which is constant on the same intervals as $\tilde{\lambda}_n$. Let $\tau_0=x-b$, $\tau_{m+1}=x+b$ and let $(\tau_i)_{i=1}^m$ be successive points of jump of $\tilde{\lambda}_n$ in the interval $(x-b,x+b)$. Then, for $u\in(\tau_i,\tau_{i+1}]$, we choose

$$\overline{a}_{n,x}\overline{\Phi}_n(u;\hat{\beta}_n)=a_{n,x}(\hat{A}_n(u))\Phi_n(\hat{A}_n(u);\hat{\beta}_n), \tag{15}$$

where for $u\in(\tau_i,\tau_{i+1}]$,

$$\hat{A}_n(u)=\begin{cases}\tau_i, & \text{if } \lambda_0(t)>\tilde{\lambda}_n(\tau_{i+1}),\ \text{for all } t\in(\tau_i,\tau_{i+1}],\\ s, & \text{if } \lambda_0(s)=\tilde{\lambda}_n(s),\ \text{for some } s\in(\tau_i,\tau_{i+1}],\\ \tau_{i+1}, & \text{if } \lambda_0(t)<\tilde{\lambda}_n(\tau_{i+1}),\ \text{for all } t\in(\tau_i,\tau_{i+1}].\end{cases} \tag{16}$$

Furthermore, let E_n be the event from Lemma 3.1 and define

$$\overline{\Psi}_{n,x}(u) = \frac{\overline{a}_{n,x}\overline{\Phi}_n(u;\hat{\beta}_n)}{\Phi_n(u;\hat{\beta}_n)}\,\mathbb{1}_{E_n}, \quad u \in [x-b, x+b], \tag{17}$$

and $\overline{\Psi}_{n,x}(u) = 0$, for $u \neq [x-b, x+b]$. Note that, since $u \leq x+b < M < T_{(n)}$ on the event E_n, we have $\Phi_n(u;\hat{\beta}_n) > 0$ (see the proof of Lemma 3.1), and thus $\overline{\Psi}_{n,x}(u)$ is well defined. Now, define the following piecewise constant modification of $\theta_{n,x}$, by

$$\overline{\theta}_{n,x}(u,\delta,z) = \delta\,\overline{\Psi}_{n,x}(u) - \mathrm{e}^{\hat{\beta}_n' z}\int_0^u \overline{\Psi}_{n,x}(v)\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{\Lambda}_n(v). \tag{18}$$

We then have the following property. The proof can be found in Section 5.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\overline{\theta}_{n,x}$ be defined in* (18)*. Then*

$$\int \overline{\theta}_{n,x}(u,\delta,z)\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_n(u,\delta,z) = 0. \tag{19}$$

At this point it is important to discuss in some detail how we will obtain suitable bounds for the second integral in (12). In order to do so, we first introduce the inverse process $\tilde{U}_n$. It is defined by

$$\tilde{U}_n(a) = \operatorname*{argmin}_{x\in[0,T_{(n)}]} \{\Lambda_n(x) - ax\}. \tag{20}$$

and it satisfies the switching relation, $\tilde{\lambda}_n(x) \leq a$ if and only if $\tilde{U}_n(a) \geq x$, for $x \leq T_{(n)}$. In their analysis of the current status model, Groeneboom *et al* [19] encounter an integral that is similar to the second integral in (12). They bound this integral using that the maximal distance between succeeding points of jump of the isotonic estimator is of the order $O_p(n^{-1/3}\log n)$. Such a property typically relies on the exponential bounds for the tail probabilities of $\tilde{U}_n(a)$, obtained either by using a suitable exponential martingale (e.g., see Lemma 5.9 in [20]), or by an embedding of the relevant sum process into Brownian motion or Brownian bridge (e.g., see Lemma 5.1 in [9]). Unfortunately, an embedding of the process Λ_n is not available and in our current situation the martingale approach only yields to polynomial bounds for tail probabilities of $\tilde{U}_n(a)$. A polynomial bound was also found by Durot [7] (see her Lemma 2) leading to

$$\sup_{x\in I_n} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\tilde{\lambda}_n(x) - \lambda_0(x)\right)^p\right] \leq K n^{-p/3}, \tag{21}$$

for $p \in [1,2)$ and some interval I_n (see her Theorem 1). By intersecting with the event E_n from Lemma 3.1 we extend (21) to a similar bound for $p = 2$. Groeneboom and Jongbloed [17] provide an alternative approach to bound the second integral in (12), based on bounds for (21) with $p = 2$. Unfortunately, they still make use of the fact that the maximum distance between succeeding points of jump of the isotonic estimator is of the order $O_p(n^{-1/3}\log n)$ to obtain a result similar to (24). Nevertheless, we do follow the

approach in [17], but instead of using the maximum distance between succeeding points of jump of $\tilde{\lambda}_n$, we use a bound on

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{x\in[\epsilon,M]}\left(\tilde{\lambda}_n(x)-\lambda_0(x)\right)^2\right], \tag{22}$$

for $0<\epsilon<M<\tau_H$. Exponential bounds for the tail probabilities of $\tilde{U}_n(a)$ would yield the same bound for (22) as the one in (21) apart from a factor $\log n$. Since we can only obtain polynomial bounds on the tail probabilities of $\tilde{U}_n(a)$, we establish a bound for (22) of the order $O(n^{-4/9})$. This is probably not optimal, but this will turn out to be sufficient for our purposes and leads to the following intermediate result, of which the proof can be found in Section 5.

Lemma 3.3. *Fix $x\in(0,\tau_h)$ and let $\theta_{n,x}$ and $\bar{\theta}_{n,x}$ be defined by (14) and (18), respectively. Assume that λ_0 is differentiable, such that λ_0' is uniformly bounded above and below by strictly positive constants. Assume that $x\mapsto\Phi(x;\beta_0)$ is differentiable with a bounded derivative in a neighborhood of x. Let k have support $[-1,1]$ and suppose it is differentiable with a uniformly bounded derivative. Then, it holds*

$$\int\left\{\overline{\theta}_{n,x}(u,\delta,z)-\theta_{n,x}(u,\delta,z)\right\}\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(u,\delta,z)=O_p(b^{-1}n^{-2/3}).$$

The last step is to replace $\overline{\theta}_{n,x}$ in the first integral of (12) with a deterministic approximation. This is done in the next lemma, of which the proof can be found in Section 5.

Lemma 3.4. *Fix $x\in(0,\tau_h)$ and take $0<\epsilon<x<M'<M<\tau_H$. Assume that λ_0 is differentiable, such that λ_0' is uniformly bounded above and below by strictly positive constants. Assume that $x\mapsto\Phi(x;\beta_0)$ is differentiable with a bounded derivative in a neighborhood of x. Let $\bar{\theta}_{n,x}$ be defined in (18) and define*

$$\eta_{n,x}(u,\delta,z)=\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left(\delta\,a_{n,x}(u)-\mathrm{e}^{\beta_0'z}\int_0^u a_{n,x}(v)\,\mathrm{d}\Lambda_0(v)\right),\quad u\in[0,\tau_H]. \tag{23}$$

where $a_{n,x}$ is defined in (13) and E_n is the event from Lemma 3.1. Let k have support $[-1,1]$, and suppose it is differentiable with a uniformly bounded derivative. Then, it holds

$$\int\left\{\overline{\theta}_{n,x}(u,\delta,z)-\eta_{n,x}(u,\delta,z)\right\}\,\mathrm{d}(\mathbb{P}_n-\mathbb{P})(u,\delta,z)=O_p(b^{-3/2}n^{-13/18})+O_p(n^{-1/2}) \tag{24}$$

We are now in the position to state our first main result.

Theorem 3.5. *Fix $x\in(0,\tau_h)$. Assume that λ_0 is $m\geq 2$ times continuously differentiable in x, such that λ_0' is uniformly bounded above and below by strictly positive constants. Moreover, assume that $t\mapsto\Phi(t;\beta_0)$ is differentiable with a bounded derivative in a neighborhood of x. Let k be m-orthogonal with support $[-1,1]$ and suppose it is differentiable with a uniformly bounded derivative. Let $\tilde{\lambda}^{SG}$ be defined in (9) and assume that $n^{1/(2m+1)}b\to c>0$. Then, it holds*

$$n^{m/(2m+1)}\left(\tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x)-\lambda_0(x)\right)\xrightarrow{d}N(\mu,\sigma^2),$$

where

$$\mu = \frac{(-c)^m}{m!}\lambda_0^{(m)}(x)\int_{-1}^{1} k(y)y^m \,\mathrm{d}y \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma^2 = \frac{\lambda_0(x)}{c\Phi(x;\beta_0)}\int k^2(u)\,\mathrm{d}u. \tag{25}$$

Furthermore,

$$n^{2/5}\left(\tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x) - \tilde{\lambda}_n^{SM}(x)\right) \to 0, \tag{26}$$

in probability, where $\tilde{\lambda}_n^{SM}(x)$ *is defined in* (8)*, so that* $\tilde{\lambda}_n^{SM}(x)$ *has the same limiting distribution as* $\tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x)$*.*

Proof. Choose $0 < \epsilon < x < M' < M < \tau_H$, so that for n sufficiently large, we have $\epsilon < x - b \le x + b \le M'$. Consider the event E_n from Lemma 3.1 and choose $\xi_1, \xi_2 > 0$ and ξ_3, such that it satisfies (54). We write

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x) &= \int k_b(x-u)\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{\Lambda}_n(u)\\ &= \int k_b(x-u)\,\mathrm{d}\Lambda_0(u) + \mathbb{1}_{E_n}\int k_b(x-u)\,\mathrm{d}(\tilde{\Lambda}_n - \Lambda_0)(u)\\ &\qquad + \mathbb{1}_{E_n^c}\int k_b(x-u)\,\mathrm{d}(\tilde{\Lambda}_n - \Lambda_0)(u).\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Because $\mathbb{1}_{E_n^c} \to 0$ in probability, the third term on the right hand side tends to zero in probability. For the first term, we obtain from a change of variable, a Taylor expansion, and the properties of the kernel:

$$\begin{aligned}&n^{m/(2m+1)}\left\{\int k_b(x-u)\,\lambda_0(u)\,\mathrm{d}u - \lambda_0(x)\right\}\\ &= n^{m/(2m+1)}\int_{-1}^{1} k(y)\left\{\lambda_0(x-by) - \lambda_0(x)\right\}\,\mathrm{d}y\\ &= n^{m/(2m+1)}\int_{-1}^{1} k(y)\left\{-\lambda_0'(x)by + \cdots + \frac{\lambda_0^{(m-1)}(x)}{(m-1)!}(-by)^{m-1} + \frac{\lambda_0^{(m)}(\xi_n)}{m!}(-by)^m\right\}\,\mathrm{d}y\\ &\to \frac{(-c)^m}{m!}\lambda_0^{(m)}(x)\int_{-1}^{1} k(y)y^m\,\mathrm{d}y,\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

with $|\xi_n - x| < b|y|$. Finally, for the second term on the right hand side of (27), Lemmas 3.1 to 3.4 yield that

$$\begin{aligned}&n^{m/(2m+1)}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\int k_b(x-u)\,\mathrm{d}(\tilde{\Lambda}_n - \Lambda_0)(u)\\ &= n^{m/(2m+1)}\int \eta_{n,x}(u,\delta,z)\,\mathrm{d}(\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P})(u,\delta,z) + o_p(1).\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

For the first term on the right hand side of (29) we can write

$$\begin{aligned} & n^{m/(2m+1)} \int \eta_{n,x}(u,\delta,z)\,\mathrm{d}(\mathbb{P}_n-\mathbb{P})(u,\delta,z) \\ &= n^{m/(2m+1)} \mathbb{1}_{E_n} \int \frac{\delta k_b(x-u)}{\Phi(u;\beta_0)}\,\mathrm{d}(\mathbb{P}_n-\mathbb{P})(u,\delta,z) \\ &\quad - n^{m/(2m+1)} \mathbb{1}_{E_n} \int \mathrm{e}^{\beta_0' z} \int_0^u a_{n,x}(v)\,\mathrm{d}\Lambda_0(v)\,\mathrm{d}(\mathbb{P}_n-\mathbb{P})(u,\delta,z). \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

We will show that the first term on the right hand is asymptotically normal and the second term tends to zero in probability. Define $Y_{n,i} = n^{-(m+1)/(2m+1)} \Delta_i k_b(x-T_i)/\Phi(T_i;\beta_0)$, so that the first term on the right hand side of (30) can be written as

$$\mathbb{1}_{E_n} n^{m/(2m+1)} \int \frac{\delta k_b(x-u)}{\Phi(u;\beta_0)}\,\mathrm{d}(\mathbb{P}_n-\mathbb{P})(u,\delta,z) = \mathbb{1}_{E_n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(Y_{n,i} - \mathbb{E}\left[Y_{n,i}\right]\right).$$

Using (3), together with a Taylor expansion and the boundedness assumptions on the derivatives of λ_0 and $\Phi(x;\beta_0)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathrm{Var}(Y_{n,i}) &= n^{-1/(2m+1)} \left\{ \int \frac{k_b^2(x-u)}{\Phi(u;\beta_0)^2}\,\mathrm{d}H^{uc}(u) - \left(\int \frac{k_b(x-u)}{\Phi(u;\beta_0)}\,\mathrm{d}H^{uc}(u) \right)^2 \right\} \\ &= n^{-1/(2m+1)} \left\{ \frac{1}{b} \int_{-1}^1 k^2(y) \frac{\lambda_0(x-by)}{\Phi(x-by;\beta_0)}\,\mathrm{d}y - \left(\int k_b(x-u)\,\lambda_0(u)\,\mathrm{d}u \right)^2 \right\} \\ &= \frac{\lambda_0(x)}{c\Phi(x;\beta_0)} \int_{-1}^1 k^2(y)\,\mathrm{d}y - n^{-1/(2m+1)} \int_{-1}^1 y k^2(y) \left[\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x} \frac{\lambda_0(x)}{\Phi(x;\beta_0)} \right]_{x=\xi_y} \mathrm{d}y + o(1) \\ &= \frac{\lambda_0(x)}{c\Phi(x;\beta_0)} \int_{-1}^1 k^2(y)\,\mathrm{d}y + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $|Y_{n,i}| \le n^{-m/(2m+1)} \Phi(M;\beta_0)^{-1} \sup_{x\in[-1,1]} k(x)$, so that $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}\big[|Y_{n,i}|^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{|Y_{n,i}|>\epsilon\}}\big] \to 0$, for any $\epsilon > 0$, since $\mathbb{1}_{\{|Y_{n,i}|>\epsilon\}} = 0$, for n sufficiently large. Consequently, by Lindeberg central limit theorem, and the fact that $\mathbb{1}_{E_n} \to 1$ in probability, we obtain

$$\mathbb{1}_{E_n} n^{m/(2m+1)} \int \frac{\delta k_b(x-u)}{\Phi(u;\beta_0)}\,\mathrm{d}(\mathbb{P}_n-\mathbb{P})(u,\delta,z) \to N(0,\sigma^2). \tag{31}$$

For the second term on the right hand side of (30), write

$$n^{m/(2m+1)} \int \mathrm{e}^{\beta_0' z} \int_0^u a_{n,x}(v)\,\mathrm{d}\Lambda_0(v)\,\mathrm{d}(\mathbb{P}_n-\mathbb{P})(u,\delta,z) = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\widetilde{Y}_{n,i} - \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{Y}_{n,i}] \right).$$

where

$$\widetilde{Y}_{n,i} = n^{-(m+1)/(2m+1)} \mathrm{e}^{\beta_0' Z_i} \int_0^{T_i} \frac{k_b(x-v)}{\Phi(v;\beta_0)}\,\mathrm{d}\Lambda_0(v).$$

We have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{Var}(\widetilde{Y}_{n,i}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left[\widetilde{Y}_{n,i}^2\right] \leq n^{-1/(2m+1)} \int \mathrm{e}^{2\beta_0' z} \left(\int_0^u \frac{k_b(x-v)}{\Phi(v;\beta_0)} \,\mathrm{d}\Lambda_0(v) \right)^2 \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(u,\delta,z),$$

where the integral on the right hand side is bounded by

$$\left(\int_{x-b}^{x+b} \frac{k_b(x-v)}{\Phi(v;\beta_0)} \,\mathrm{d}\Lambda_0(v) \right)^2 \Phi(0;2\beta_0) \leq \frac{\Phi(0;2\beta_0)}{\Phi^2(M;\beta_0)} \left(\int_{x-b}^{x+b} k_b(x-v) \,\mathrm{d}\Lambda_0(v) \right)^2 = O(1).$$

Hence, the second term on the right hand side of (30) tends to zero in probability. Together with (27), (28), and (31), this proves the first part of the theorem.

For the smoothed maximum likelihood estimator, we can follow the same approach and obtain similar results as those in Lemmas 3.1 to 3.4. The arguments are more or less the same as those used to prove Lemmas 3.1 to 3.4 and for details we refer to Section B in [25]. From (27) and (29), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} n^{m/(2m+1)} \tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x) = n^{m/(2m+1)} &\int k_b(x-u) \,\mathrm{d}\Lambda_0(u) \\ &+ n^{m/(2m+1)} \int \eta_{n,x}(u,\delta,z) \,\mathrm{d}(\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P})(u,\delta,z) + o_p(1) \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

where $\eta_{n,x}$ is defined in (23) and where

$$n^{m/(2m+1)} \int \eta_{n,x}(u,\delta,z) \,\mathrm{d}(\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P})(u,\delta,z) \to N(0,\sigma^2). \tag{33}$$

Similarly, from the results in Section B of [25], we have that there exists an event $\widehat{E}_n$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} n^{m/(2m+1)} \tilde{\lambda}_n^{SM}(x) = n^{m/(2m+1)} &\int k_b(x-u) \,\mathrm{d}\Lambda_0(u) \\ &+ n^{m/(2m+1)} \int \widehat{\eta}_{n,x}(u,\delta,z) \,\mathrm{d}(\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P})(u,\delta,z) + o_p(1) \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

where $\widehat{\eta}_{n,x}$ is defined in (23) with $\hat{E}_n$ instead of E_n, where $\mathbb{1}_{\widehat{E}_n} \to 1$ in probability, and where

$$n^{m/(2m+1)} \int \widehat{\eta}_{n,x}(u,\delta,z) \,\mathrm{d}(\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P})(u,\delta,z) \to N(0,\sigma^2). \tag{35}$$

Together with (33) and (35), this means that

$$\begin{aligned} &n^{m/(2m+1)} \left(\tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x) - \hat{\lambda}_n^{SM}(x) \right) \\ &= \left(\mathbb{1}_{\widehat{E}_n^c} \mathbb{1}_{E_n} - \mathbb{1}_{E_n^c} \mathbb{1}_{\widehat{E}_n} \right) n^{m/(2m+1)} \int \left\{ \delta a_{n,x}(u) - \mathrm{e}^{\beta_0' z} \int_0^u a_{n,x}(v) \,\mathrm{d}\Lambda_0(v) \right\} \mathrm{d}(\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P}) + o_p(1) \\ &= \mathbb{1}_{\widehat{E}_n^c} O_p(1) - \mathbb{1}_{E_n^c} O_p(1) + o_p(1) = o_p(1), \end{aligned}$$

because $\mathbb{1}_{\widehat{E}_n^c} \to 0$ and $\mathbb{1}_{E_n^c} \to 0$ in probability. □

Note that in the special case $\beta_0 = 0$ and $m = 2$, we recover Theorem 3.2 in [23] and Theorem 11.8 in [17], for the right censoring model without covariates. The fact that $\tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x)$ and $\hat{\lambda}_n^{SM}(x)$ are asymptotically equivalent does not come as a surprise, since for the corresponding isotonic estimators according to Theorem 2 in [26], for $x \in (0, \tau_H)$ fixed, $n^{1/3}\big(\tilde{\lambda}_n(x) - \hat{\lambda}_n(x)\big) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$. However, we have not been able to exploit this fact, and we have established the asymptotic equivalence in (26) by obtaining the expansions in (32) and (34) separately for each estimator.

4. Numerical results for pointwise confidence intervals

In this section we illustrate the finite sample performance of the four estimators considered previously by constructing pointwise confidence intervals for the baseline hazard rate. We consider two different procedures: the first relies on the limit distribution and the second is a bootstrap based method.

From Theorem 3.5 it can be seen that the asymptotic $100(1-\alpha)\%$-confidence intervals at the point $x_0 \in (0, \tau_H)$ are of the form

$$\lambda_n^s(x_0) \pm n^{-2/5} \left\{ \widehat{\sigma}_n(x_0) q_{1-\alpha/2} + \widehat{\mu}_n(x_0) \right\},$$

where $q_{1-\alpha/2}$ is the $(1-\alpha/2)$ quantile of the standard normal distribution, $\lambda_n^s(x_0)$ is the smooth isotonic estimator at hand (SG or SMLE), and $\widehat{\sigma}_n(x_0)$, $\widehat{\mu}_n(x_0)$ are corresponding plug-in estimators of the asymptotic mean and standard deviation, respectively. In order to avoid estimation of the bias, we use undersmoothing (see also [21], [18], [3]).

In our simulations, the event times are generated from a Weibull baseline distribution with shape parameter 1.5 and scale 1. The real valued covariate and the censoring time are chosen to be uniformly distributed on the interval $(0, 1)$ and we take $\beta_0 = 0.5$. We note that this setup corresponds to around 35% uncensored observations. Confidence intervals are calculated at the point $x_0 = 0.5$ using 1000 sets of data and we take the bandwidth $b = n^{-1/4}$. Table 1 shows the performance, for various sample sizes, of the confidence

	SG		SMLE	
n	AL	CP	AL	CP
50	1.458	0.715	1.598	0.764
100	1.038	0.737	1.090	0.794
500	0.537	0.807	0.561	0.856
1000	0.428	0.848	0.434	0.875
5000	0.232	0.895	0.234	0.912

Table 1. The average length (AL) and the coverage probabilities (CP) for 95% pointwise confidence intervals of the baseline hazard rate at the point $x_0 = 0.5$ based on the asymptotic distribution.

intervals based on the asymptotic distribution of the two estimators. Even though the



(A) SG (B) SMLE

FIGURE 2. 95% confidence intervals based on the asymptotic distribution for the baseline hazard rate using undersmoothing.

coverage probabilities are far from the nominal level of 95%, smoothing leads to significantly more accurate results in comparison with the non-smoothed estimators. For instance, for the same data, the Grenander-type estimator leads to coverage probabilities 0.468, 0.479, 0.593, 0.642 and 0.783, corresponding to the various sample sizes. As expected, as the sample size increases we get shorter confidence intervals and higher coverage probabilities. It is important to note that the performance depends strongly on the choice of the constant c because the asymptotic length is inversely proportional to c. This means that, by choosing a larger c we get wider confidence interval and as a result higher coverage probabilities. However, it is not clear which would be the optimal choice of such a constant. This is actually a common problem in the literature (see for example [3] and [15]), but it is beyond the scope of this paper to investigate methods of bandwidth selection. Turning back to our results, we notice that the two estimators are comparable with each other. The SMLE has somewhat better coverage probabilities but also longer confidence intervals. The behavior of the two methods for a fixed sample size $n = 500$ at different points of the support is illustrated in Figure 2. The results are again comparable and the common feature is that the length increases as we move to the left boundary. This is due to the fact that the length is proportional to the asymptotic standard deviation, which in this case turns out to be increasing.

In an attempt to improve the coverage probabilities, we also construct bootstrap confidence intervals based on the smoothed Grenander-type estimator. Studies on bootstrap confidence intervals in the Cox model are investigated in [2] and [36]. We follow one of

n	AL	CP
100	1.998	0.966
500	0.759	0.931
1000	0.540	0.917

TABLE 2. The average length (AL) and the coverage probabilities (CP) for the 95% bootstrap confidence intervals of the baseline hazard rate at the point $x_0 = 0.5$ based on the SG estimator.

their proposals for a smooth bootstrap. We fix the covariates and we generate the event time X_i^* from a smooth estimate for the density of X conditional on Z_i:

$$\hat{f}_n(x|Z_i) = \tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x)\mathrm{e}^{\hat{\beta}_n' Z_i} \exp\left\{-\hat{\Lambda}_n^s(x)\mathrm{e}^{\hat{\beta}_n' Z_i}\right\},$$

and the censoring times C_i^* are generated from the Kaplan-Meier estimate $\hat{G}_n$. Then we take $T_i^* = \min(X_i^*, C_i^*)$ and $\Delta_i^* = \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i^* \le C_i^*\}}$. For constructing the confidence intervals, we take 10 000 bootstrap samples (T_i^*, Δ_i^*, Z_i) and for each boostrap sample we compute the smoothed Grenander-type estimate $\tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG,*}(x_0)$ as well as the plug-in estimate $\hat{\sigma}_n^*(x_0)$ from Theorem 3.5, and standardize with the smoothed Grenander-type estimate $\tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x_0)$ of the original sample:

$$z_n^*(x_0) = \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG,*}(x_0) - \tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x_0)}{\hat{\sigma}_n^*(x_0)}.$$

Then, the $100(1-\alpha)\%$ confidence interval is

$$\left[\tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x_0) - q_{1-\alpha/2}^*(x_0)\hat{\sigma}_n(x_0), \tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x_0) - q_{\alpha/2}^*(x_0)\hat{\sigma}_n(x_0)\right],$$

where $q_\alpha^*(x_0)$ is the αth percentile of the 10 000 values of $z_n^*(x_0)$. The average length and the empirical coverage for 1000 iterations and different sample sizes are reported in Table 2. The coverage probabilities are better than the ones for SG in Table 1, but the bootstrap confidence intervals are wider. However, it is surprising that the performance is better at small sample sizes and then the coverage decreases as n becomes larger. Something similar was observed in [1] for the right censored model (for example with a sample size 500 he gets coverage 0.935).

5. PROOFS

Proof of Lemma 3.1. Define $D_n^{(1)}(x;\beta) = \partial\Phi_n(x;\beta)/\partial\beta$. Then according to the proof of Lemma 3(iv) in [26], for any sequence β_n^*, such that $\beta_n^* \to \beta_0$ almost surely, it holds

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} |D_n^{(1)}(x;\beta_n^*)| < \infty.$$

In fact, from its proof, it can be seen that

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} |D_{nj}^{(1)}(x;\beta_n^*)| \leq \sum_{I_k\subseteq I} \left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n |Z_i|\, \mathrm{e}^{\gamma_k' Z_i} \right] \to \sum_{I_k\subseteq I} \mathbb{E}\left[|Z| \mathrm{e}^{\gamma_k' Z} \right] < 2^p \sup_{|\beta-\beta_0|\leq\epsilon} \mathbb{E}\left[|Z| \mathrm{e}^{\beta' Z} \right] < \infty$$

with probability 1, where the summations are over all subsets $I_k = \{i_1, \ldots, i_k\}$ of $I = \{1, \ldots, p\}$, and γ_k is the vector consisting of coordinates $\gamma_{kj} = \beta_{0j} + \epsilon/(2\sqrt{p})$, for $j \in I_k$, and $\gamma_{kj} = \beta_{0j} - \epsilon/(2\sqrt{p})$, for $j \in I \setminus I_k$. Therefore,

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} |D_{n}^{(1)}(x;\beta_n^*)| \leq \sqrt{p} \sum_{I_k\subseteq I} \left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n |Z_i|\, \mathrm{e}^{\gamma_k' Z_i} \right) \to \sqrt{p} \sum_{I_k\subseteq I} \mathbb{E}\left[|Z| \mathrm{e}^{\gamma_k' Z} \right]$$

with probability one. Hence, if for some $\xi_1 > 0$,

$$E_{n,1} = \left\{ \left| \sqrt{p} \sum_{I_k\subseteq I} \left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n |Z_i|\, \mathrm{e}^{\gamma_k' Z_i} \right) - \sqrt{p} \sum_{I_k\subseteq I} \mathbb{E}\left[|Z| \mathrm{e}^{\gamma_k' Z} \right] \right| \leq \xi_1 \right\}, \tag{36}$$

then $\mathbb{1}_{E_{n,1}} \to 1$ in probability. Moreover, on this event, we have

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} |D_{n}^{(1)}(x;\beta_n^*)| \leq \sqrt{p} \sum_{I_k\subseteq I} \mathbb{E}\left[|Z| \mathrm{e}^{\gamma_k' Z} \right] + \xi_1, \tag{37}$$

i.e., $\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} |D_{n}^{(1)}(x;\beta_n^*)|$ is bounded uniformly in n. For $\xi_2, \xi_3, \xi_4 > 0$ and $0 < M < \tau_H$ define

$$\begin{aligned} E_{n,2} &= \left\{ n^{2/3} |\hat{\beta}_n - \beta_0|^2 < \xi_2 \right\}, \qquad E_{n,3} = \left\{ \sup_{x\in[0,M]} |\tilde{\Lambda}_n(x) - \Lambda_0(x)| < \xi_3 \right\}, \\ E_{n,4} &= \left\{ n^{1/3} \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} |\Phi_n(x;\beta_0) - \Phi(x;\beta_0)| \leq \xi_4 \right\}, \qquad E_{n,5} = \left\{ T_{(n)} > M \right\} \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

where $T_{(n)}$ denotes the last observed time. Because $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_n - \beta_0) = O_p(1)$ (see Theorem 3.2 in [32]), together with (7) and Lemma 4 in [26], it follows that $\mathbb{1}_{E_n} \to 1$ in probability, for the event $E_n = E_{n,1} \cap E_{n,2} \cap E_{n,3} \cap E_{n,4} \cap E_{n,5}$.

From the definitions of $a_{n,x}$, $\theta_{n,x}$ and H^{uc}, in (13), (14), and (1), respectively, we have

$$\int \theta_{n,x}(u,\delta,z)\, \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(u,\delta,z) = \mathbb{1}_{E_n} \left\{ \int a_{n,x}(u)\, \mathrm{d}H^{uc}(u) - \int \mathrm{e}^{\hat{\beta}_n' z} \int_{v=0}^{u} a_{n,x}(v)\, \mathrm{d}\tilde{\Lambda}_n(v)\, \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(u,\delta,z) \right\}.$$

Then, by applying Fubini's theorem, together with (3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int \theta_{n,x}(u,\delta,z)\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(u,\delta,z)\\
&= \mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left\{\int a_{n,x}(u)\,\mathrm{d}H^{uc}(u) - \int a_{n,x}(v)\int_{u=v}^{\infty} \mathrm{e}^{\hat{\beta}_n' z}\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(u,\delta,z)\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{\Lambda}_n(v)\right\}\\
&= \mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left\{\int a_{n,x}(u)\,\mathrm{d}H^{uc}(u) - \int a_{n,x}(v)\,\Phi(v;\hat{\beta}_n)\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{\Lambda}_n(v)\right\}\\
&= \mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left\{\int \frac{k_b(x-u)}{\Phi(u;\beta_0)}\,\mathrm{d}H^{uc}(u) - \int k_b(x-u)\,\frac{\Phi(u;\hat{\beta}_n)}{\Phi(u;\beta_0)}\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{\Lambda}_n(u)\right\}\\
&= \mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left\{-\int k_b(x-u)\,\mathrm{d}(\tilde{\Lambda}_n-\Lambda_0)(u) + \int k_b(x-u)\,\left(1-\frac{\Phi(u;\hat{\beta}_n)}{\Phi(u;\beta_0)}\right)\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{\Lambda}_n(u)\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

The mean value theorem yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\int k_b(x-u)\left|1-\frac{\Phi(u;\hat{\beta}_n)}{\Phi(u;\beta_0)}\right|\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{\Lambda}_n(u) &= \int k_b(x-u)\,\frac{|\Phi(u;\beta_0)-\Phi(u;\hat{\beta}_n)|}{\Phi(u;\beta_0)}\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{\Lambda}_n(u)\\
&\leq |\hat{\beta}_n-\beta_0|\sup_{y\in\mathbb{R}}\left|\frac{\partial\Phi(y;\beta^*)}{\partial\beta}\right|\,\frac{\tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x)}{\Phi(x+b;\beta_0)},
\end{aligned}$$

with $|\beta^*-\beta_0|\leq|\hat{\beta}_n-\beta_0|$. According to Lemma 3(iii) in [26], for $\epsilon>0$ from (A2),

$$\sup_{y\in\mathbb{R}}\left|\frac{\partial\Phi(y;\beta^*)}{\partial\beta}\right| < \sup_{y\in\mathbb{R}}\sup_{|\beta-\beta_0|<\epsilon}\left|\frac{\partial\Phi(y;\beta)}{\partial\beta}\right| < \infty.$$

Furthermore, there exists $M<\tau_H$, such that for sufficiently large n we have $x+b\leq M$. This yields the following bound $\Phi(x+b;\beta_0)\geq\Phi(M;\beta_0)>0$. Moreover, according to (10), $\tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG}(x)\to\lambda_0(x)$ with probability one. Since $|\hat{\beta}_n-\beta_0|=O_p(n^{-1/2})$ (see Theorem 3.1 in [32]), it follows that

$$\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\int k_b(x-u)\left|1-\frac{\Phi(u;\hat{\beta}_n)}{\Phi(u;\beta_0)}\right|\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{\Lambda}_n(u) = O_p(n^{-1/2}),$$

which finishes the proof. □

Proof of Lemma 3.2. By means of Fubini's theorem

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int \overline{\theta}_{n,x}(u,\delta,z)\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_n(u,\delta,z)\\
&= \int \delta\,\overline{\Psi}_{n,x}(u)\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_n(u,\delta,z) - \int \mathrm{e}^{\hat{\beta}_n' z}\int_{v=0}^{u} \overline{\Psi}_{n,x}(v)\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{\Lambda}_n(v)\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_n(u,\delta,z)\\
&= \int \delta\,\overline{\Psi}_{n,x}(u)\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_n(u,\delta,z) - \int \overline{\Psi}_{n,x}(v)\int \mathbb{1}_{\{u\geq v\}}\mathrm{e}^{\hat{\beta}_n' z}\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_n(u,\delta,z)\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{\Lambda}_n(v)\\
&= \mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left\{\int \mathbb{1}_{[x-b,x+b]}(u)\delta\,\frac{\overline{a}_{n,x}\overline{\Phi}_n(u;\hat{\beta}_n)}{\Phi_n(u;\hat{\beta}_n)}\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_n(u,\delta,z) - \int_{x-b}^{x+b}\overline{a}_{n,x}\overline{\Phi}_n(v;\hat{\beta}_n)\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{\Lambda}_n(v)\right\}\\
&= \mathbb{1}_{E_n}\sum_{i=0}^{m}\overline{a}_{n,x}\overline{\Phi}_n(\tau_{i+1};\hat{\beta}_n)\left\{\int \frac{\mathbb{1}_{(\tau_i,\tau_{i+1}]}(u)\delta}{\Phi_n(u;\hat{\beta}_n)}\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_n(u,\delta,z) - \left(\tilde{\Lambda}_n(\tau_{i+1}) - \tilde{\Lambda}_n(\tau_i)\right)\right\}
\end{aligned}$$

and (19) follows from the characterization of the Breslow estimator in (6). □

To obtain suitable bounds for (22), we will establish bounds on the tail probabilities of $\tilde{U}_n(a)$ defined in (20). To this end we consider a suitable martingale that will approximate the process $\Lambda_n - \Lambda_0$. For $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, let $N_i(t) = \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i\leq t\}}\Delta_i$ be the right continuous counting process for the number of observed failures on $(0, t]$ and $Y_i(t) = \mathbb{1}_{\{T_i\geq t\}}$ be the at-risk process. Then, for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, $M_i(t) = N_i(t) - A_i(t)$, with $A_i(t) = \int_0^t Y_i(s)\mathrm{e}^{\beta_0' Z_i}\,\mathrm{d}\Lambda_0(s)$, is a mean zero martingale with respect to the filtration

$$\mathcal{F}_t^n = \sigma\left\{\mathbb{1}_{\{X_i\leq s\}}\Delta_i, \mathbb{1}_{\{T_i\geq s\}}, Z_i : 1\leq i\leq n, 0\leq s\leq t\right\}.$$

(e.g., see [22]). Furthermore, it is square integrable, since

$$\mathbb{E}\left[M_i(t)^2\right] \leq 2 + 2\int_0^t \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{T_i\geq s\}}\mathrm{e}^{2\beta_0' Z_i}\right]\lambda_0^2(s)\,\mathrm{d}s \leq 2 + 2\tau_H\,\lambda_0^2(\tau_H)\Phi(0;2\beta_0) < \infty.$$

Finally, it has predictable variation process $\langle M_i\rangle = A_i(t)$ (e.g., see [14] or Theorem 2 of Appendix B in [31]). For each $n \geq 1$, define

$$\mathbb{N}_n(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} N_i(t), \qquad \mathbb{A}_n(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i(t), \qquad \mathbb{M}_n(t) = \mathbb{N}_n(t) - \mathbb{A}_n(t). \tag{39}$$

Then $\mathbb{M}_n(t)$ is a mean zero square integrable martingale with predictable variation process

$$\langle\mathbb{M}_n\rangle(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{n}\langle M_i\rangle(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{n}\int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{\{T_i\geq s\}}\,\mathrm{e}^{\beta_0' Z_i}\,\mathrm{d}\Lambda_0(s) = \int_0^t n\Phi_n(s;\beta_0)\,\mathrm{d}\Lambda_0(s),$$

where Φ_n is defined in (4).

Lemma 5.1. *Let $0 < M < \tau_H$ and let Φ be defined in* (2)*. Then, the process*

$$\mathbb{B}_n(t) = \int_0^{t\wedge M}\frac{1}{n\Phi(s;\beta_0)}\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{M}_n(s) \tag{40}$$

is a mean zero, square integrable martingale with respect to the filtration $\mathcal{F}_t^n$, Moreover, $\mathbb{B}_n$ has predictable variation process

$$\langle \mathbb{B}_n \rangle(t) = \int_0^{t\wedge M} \frac{\lambda_0(s)\Phi_n(s;\beta_0)}{n\Phi^2(s;\beta_0)}\,\mathrm{d}s.$$

Proof. Write

$$\mathbb{B}_n(t) = \int_0^t Y_n(s)\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{M}_n(s), \quad \text{where } Y_n(s) = \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{s\le M\}}}{n\Phi(s;\beta_0)},$$

and $\mathbb{M}_n = \mathbb{N}_n - \mathbb{A}_n$. We apply Theorem B.3.1c in [31] with Y, H, M, N, and A, replaced by $\mathbb{B}_n$, Y_n, $\mathbb{M}_n$, $\mathbb{N}_n$, and $\mathbb{A}_n$, respectively. In order to check the conditions of this theorem, note that Y_n is a predictable process satisfying $|Y_n(t)| < \infty$, almost surely, for all $t \ge 0$, and that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^t Y_n(s)\,\mathrm{d}A_n(s) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^t \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{s\le M\}}}{n\Phi(s;\beta_0)}\mathbb{1}_{\{T_i\ge s\}}\mathrm{e}^{\beta_0' Z_i}\,\mathrm{d}\Lambda_0(s)\\ &= \int_0^t \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{s\le M\}}}{\Phi(s;\beta_0)}\Phi_n(s;\beta_0)\,\mathrm{d}\Lambda_0(s) < \infty, \quad \text{a.s.}.\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, since for $s \le M$ we have $\Phi(s;\beta_0) \ge \Phi(M;\beta_0) > 0$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty Y_n^2(s)\,\mathrm{d}\langle \mathbb{M}_n\rangle(s)\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{s\le M\}}}{n\Phi^2(s;\beta_0)}\Phi_n(s;\beta_0)\,\mathrm{d}\Lambda_0(s)\right]\\ &\le \frac{\lambda_0(\tau_H)M}{n^2\Phi(M;\beta_0)}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\beta_0' Z_i}\right] < \infty,\end{aligned}$$

because of the assumption (A2). It follows from Theorem B.3.1c in [31], that $\mathbb{B}_n$ is a square integrable martingale with mean zero and predictable variation process

$$\langle \mathbb{B}_n\rangle(t) = \int_0^t Y_n^2(s)\,\mathrm{d}\langle \mathbb{M}_n\rangle(s) = \int_0^t \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{s\le M\}}}{n\Phi^2(s;\beta_0)}\Phi_n(s;\beta_0)\,\mathrm{d}\Lambda_0(s),$$

where Φ and Φ_n are defined in (2) and (4), respectively. □

It is straightforward to verify that for $t \in [0, M]$ and $M < T_{(n)}$,

$$\Lambda_n(t) - \Lambda_0(t) = \mathbb{B}_n(t) + R_n(t), \tag{41}$$

where

$$R_n(t) = \int_0^t \frac{\Phi_n(s;\beta_0)}{\Phi(s;\beta_0)}\,\mathrm{d}\Lambda_0(s) - \Lambda_0(t) + \int_0^t \left(\frac{1}{\Phi_n(s;\hat\beta_n)} - \frac{1}{\Phi(s;\beta_0)}\right)\mathrm{d}H_n^{uc}(s), \tag{42}$$

with

$$H_n^{uc}(x) = \int \delta \mathbb{1}_{\{t\le x\}}\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_n(t,\delta,z). \tag{43}$$

For establishing suitable bounds on the tail probabilities of $\tilde U_n(a)$, we need the following result for the process $\mathbb{B}_n$, which is comparable to condition (A2) in [7].

Lemma 5.2. *Let $0 < M < \tau_H$ and let $\mathbb{B}_n$ be defined as in (40). Then, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that, for all $x > 0$ and $t \in [0, M]$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{u\in[0,M],|t-u|\le x}\big(\mathbb{B}_n(u)-\mathbb{B}_n(t)\big)^2\right] \le \frac{C\,x}{n}.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 3 in [7]. First consider the case $t \le u \le t+x$. According to Lemma 5.1, $\mathbb{B}_n$ is a martingale. Hence, by Doob's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{u\in[0,M],\, t\le u\le t+x}(\mathbb{B}_n(u)-\mathbb{B}_n(t))^2\right] &\le 4\mathbb{E}\left[\big(\mathbb{B}_n\big((t+x)\wedge M\big)-\mathbb{B}_n(t)\big)^2\right] \\
&= 4\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{B}_n\big((t+x)\wedge M\big)^2-\mathbb{B}_n(t)^2\right] \\
&= 4\mathbb{E}\left[\int_t^{(t+x)\wedge M}\frac{\Phi_n(s;\beta_0)\lambda_0(s)}{n\Phi^2(s;\beta_0)}\,\mathrm{d}s\right] \\
&\le \frac{4\lambda(M)x}{n\Phi^2(M;\beta_0)}\mathbb{E}\left[\Phi_n(0;\beta_0)\right],
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

where according to (A2),

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\Phi_n(0;\beta_0)\right] = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\beta_0' Z_i}\right] \le C,$$

for some $C > 0$. This proves the lemma for the case $t \le u \le t + x$.

For the case $t - x \le u \le t$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{u\in[0,M],t-x\le u\le t}\big(\mathbb{B}_n(u)-\mathbb{B}_n(t)\big)^2\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{0\vee(t-x)\le u\le t}\big(\mathbb{B}_n(u)-\mathbb{B}_n(t)\big)^2\right] \\
&\le 2\mathbb{E}\left[\big(\mathbb{B}_n(t)-\mathbb{B}_n(0\vee(t-x))\big)^2\right] + 2\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{0\vee(t-x)\le u<t}\big(\mathbb{B}_n(u)-\mathbb{B}_n(0\vee(t-x))\big)^2\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Then similar to (44), the right hand side is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
&2\mathbb{E}\left[\big(\mathbb{B}_n(t)-\mathbb{B}_n(0\vee(t-x))\big)^2\right] + 8\mathbb{E}\left[\big(\mathbb{B}_n(t)-\mathbb{B}_n(0\vee(t-x))\big)^2\right] \\
&= 10\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{B}_n(t)^2-\mathbb{B}_n(0\vee(t-x))^2\right] = 10\mathbb{E}\left[\int_{0\vee(t-x)}^t\frac{\Phi_n(s;\beta_0)\,\lambda_0(s)}{n\Phi^2(s;\beta_0)}\,\mathrm{d}s\right] \\
&\le \frac{10\,\lambda(M)\,x}{n\Phi^2(M;\beta_0)}\,\mathbb{E}\left[\Phi_n(0;\beta_0)\right] \le \frac{Cx}{n},
\end{aligned}$$

for some $C > 0$. This concludes the proof. □

In what follows, let $0 < M < \tau_H$. Moreover, let U be the inverse of λ_0 on $[\lambda_0(0), \lambda_0(M)]$, i.e.,

$$U(a) = \begin{cases} 0 & a < \lambda_0(0); \\ \lambda_0^{-1}(a) & a \in [\lambda_0(0), \lambda_0(M)]; \\ M & a > \lambda_0(M). \end{cases} \tag{45}$$

Note that U is continuous and differentiable on $(\lambda_0(0), \lambda_0(M))$, but it is different from the inverse of λ_0 on the entire interval $[\lambda_0(0), \lambda_0(\tau_H)]$.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $0 < M < \tau_H$ and let $\tilde{U}_n$ and U be defined in* (20) *and* (45)*, respectively. Suppose that H^{uc}, defined in* (1)*, has a bounded derivative h^{uc} on $[0, M]$ and that λ_0' is bounded below by a strictly positive constant. Then, there exists an event E_n, such that $\mathbb{1}_{E_n} \to 1$ in probability, and a constant K such that, for every $a \geq 0$ and $x > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{|\tilde{U}_n(a) - U(a)| \geq x\right\} \cap E_n \cap \left\{\tilde{U}_n(a) \leq M\right\}\right) \leq K \max\left\{\frac{1}{nx^3}, \frac{1}{n^3x^5}\right\}, \tag{46}$$

for n sufficiently large.

Note that Lemma 5.2 and Lemma 5.3 correspond to Theorem 3(i) and Lemma 2 in [7]. It is useful to spend some words on the restriction to the event $E_n \cap \{\tilde{U}_n(a) \leq M\}$. The event $\{\tilde{U}_n(a) \leq M\}$ is implicit in [7], because there the Grenander-type estimator is defined by only considering Λ_n on a compact interval not containing the end point of the support. The event E_n is needed in our setup because of the presence of the covariates, which lead to more complicated processes, and because we require (21) for $p = 2$.

Proof of Lemma 5.3. First, we note that, from the definition of U and the fact that $\tilde{U}_n$ is increasing, it follows that $|\tilde{U}_n(a) - U(a)| \leq |\tilde{U}_n(\lambda_0(0)) - U(\lambda_0(0))|$, if $a \leq \lambda_0(0)$, and

$$\mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{U}_n(a) \leq M\}}|\tilde{U}_n(a) - U(a)| \leq \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{U}_n(a) \leq M\}}|\tilde{U}_n(\lambda_0(M)) - U(\lambda_0(M))|, \qquad \text{if } a \geq \lambda_0(M),$$

Hence, it suffices to prove (46) only for $a \in [\lambda_0(0), \lambda_0(M)]$. Let E_n be the event from Lemma 3.1. We start by writing

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{|\tilde{U}_n(a) - U(a)| \geq x\right\} \cap E_n \cap \left\{\tilde{U}_n(a) \leq M\right\}\right) \\ &\quad = \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{U(a) + x \leq \tilde{U}_n(a) \leq M\right\} \cap E_n\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\tilde{U}_n(a) \leq U(a) - x\right\} \cap E_n\right). \end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

First consider the first probability on the right hand side of (47). It is zero, if $U(a)+x > M$. Otherwise, if $U(a) + x \leq M$, then $x \leq M$ and

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{U(a) + x \leq \tilde{U}_n(a) \leq M\right\} \cap E_n\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\Big(\{\Lambda_n(y) - ay \leq \Lambda_n(U(a)) - aU(a), \text{for some } y \in [U(a) + x, M]\} \cap E_n\Big) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\inf_{y \in [U(a)+x, M]} \Big(\Lambda_n(y) - ay - \Lambda_n(U(a)) + a\,U(a)\Big) \leq 0\right\} \cap E_n\right). \end{aligned}$$

From Taylor's expansion, we obtain $\Lambda_0(y)-\Lambda_0(U(a)) \geq \big(y-U(a)\big)a+c\big(y-U(a)\big)^2$, where $c = \inf_{t\in[0,\tau_F)} \lambda_0'(t)/2 > 0$, so that with (41), the probability on the right hand side is bounded by

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\inf_{y\in[U(a)+x,M]}\Big(\mathbb{B}_n(y)-\mathbb{B}_n(U(a))+R_n(y)-R_n(U(a))+c(y-U(a))^2\Big)\leq 0\right\}\cap E_n\right).$$

Let $i \geq 0$ be such that $M-U(a)\in[x2^i, x2^{i+1})$ and note that, on the event E_n one has $T_{(n)} \geq M$. Therefore, if $U(a) < y \leq M$, then $y \leq T_{(n)}$ and $U(a) < T_{(n)}$. It follows that the previous probability can be bounded by

$$\sum_{k=0}^{i}\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\sup_{y\in I_k}\Big(\big|\mathbb{B}_n(y)-\mathbb{B}_n(U(a))\big|+|R_n(y)-R_n(U(a))|\Big)\geq c\,x^2\,2^{2k}\right\}\cap E_n\right).$$

where the supremum is taken over $y\in[0,M]$, such that $y-U(a)\in[x2^k, x2^{k+1})$. Using that $\mathbb{P}(X+Y\geq\epsilon)\leq\mathbb{P}(X\geq\epsilon/2)+\mathbb{P}(Y\geq\epsilon/2)$, together with the Markov inequality, we can bound this probability by

$$\begin{aligned}
&4\sum_{k=0}^{i}\big(c^2x^4 2^{4k}\big)^{-1}\,\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{y\leq M,\, y-U(a)\in[x2^k,x2^{k+1})}\big|\mathbb{B}_n(y)-\mathbb{B}_n(U(a))\big|^2\right]\\
&\quad+8\sum_{k=0}^{i}\big(c^3x^6 2^{6k}\big)^{-1}\,\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{y<M,\, y-U(a)\in[x2^k,x2^{k+1})}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\big|R_n(y)-R_n(U(a))\big|^3\right].
\end{aligned}\tag{48}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{y<M,\, y-U(a)\in[x2^k,x2^{k+1})}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\big|R_n(y)-R_n(U(a))\big|^3\right]\\
&\leq 4\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{y<M,\, y-U(a)\in[x2^k,x2^{k+1})}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left|\int_{U(a)}^{y}\left(\frac{\Phi_n(s;\beta_0)}{\Phi(s;\beta_0)}-1\right)\lambda_0(s)\mathrm{d}s\right|^3\right]\\
&\quad+4\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{y<M,\, y-U(a)\in[x2^k,x2^{k+1})}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left|\int_{U(a)}^{y}\left(\frac{1}{\Phi_n(s;\hat\beta_n)}-\frac{1}{\Phi(s;\beta_0)}\right)\mathrm{d}H_n^{uc}(s)\right|^3\right]
\end{aligned}\tag{49}$$

For the first term in the right hand side of (49) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{y<M,\, y-U(a)\in[x2^k,x2^{k+1})}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left|\int_{U(a)}^{y}\left(\frac{\Phi_n(s;\beta_0)}{\Phi(s;\beta_0)}-1\right)\lambda_0(s)\mathrm{d}s\right|^3\right]\\
&\leq\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left(\int_{U(a)}^{(U(a)+x2^{k+1})\wedge M}\frac{|\Phi_n(s;\beta_0)-\Phi(s;\beta_0)|}{\Phi(s;\beta_0)}\lambda_0(s)\,\mathrm{d}s\right)^3\right]\\
&\leq\frac{x^3 2^{3(k+1)}\lambda_0^3(M)}{\Phi(M;\beta_0)^3}\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\sup_{s\in[0,M]}|\Phi_n(s;\beta_0)-\Phi(s;\beta_0)|^3\right]\leq\frac{x^3 2^{3(k+1)}\,\lambda_0^3(M)\xi_4}{n\Phi(M;\beta_0)^3},
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used (38). In order to bound the second term on the right hand side of (49), note that on the event E_n,

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}|\Phi_n(x;\hat\beta_n)-\Phi(x;\beta_0)| &\le \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}|\Phi_n(x;\hat\beta_n)-\Phi_n(x;\beta_0)|+\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}|\Phi_n(x;\beta_0)-\Phi(x;\beta_0)|\\ &\le |\hat\beta_n-\beta_0|\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}|D_n^{(1)}(x;\beta^*)|+\frac{\xi_4}{n^{1/3}}\le\frac{\sqrt{\xi_2}L+\xi_4}{n^{1/3}}.\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

In particular, for sufficiently large n we have $\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}\left|\Phi_n(x;\hat\beta_n)-\Phi(x;\beta_0)\right|\le\Phi(M;\beta_0)/2$, which yields that, for $x\in[0,M]$,

$$\Phi_n(x;\hat\beta_n)\ge\Phi(x;\beta_0)-\frac{1}{2}\Phi(M;\beta_0)\ge\frac{1}{2}\Phi(M;\beta_0). \tag{51}$$

Using (50), on the event E_n, for n sufficiently large, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{s\in[0,M]}\left|\frac{1}{\Phi_n(s;\hat\beta_n)}-\frac{1}{\Phi(s;\beta_0)}\right| &\le \sup_{s\in[0,M]}\frac{\left|\Phi_n(s;\hat\beta_n)-\Phi(s;\beta_0)\right|}{\Phi_n(s;\hat\beta_n)\,\Phi(s;\beta_0)}\\ &\le\frac{2}{\Phi^2(M;\beta_0)}\sup_{s\in[0,M]}\left|\Phi_n(s;\hat\beta_n)-\Phi(s;\beta_0)\right|\\ &\le Cn^{-1/3},\end{aligned}$$

for some $C>0$. Consequently, for the second term in the right hand side of (49) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{y<M,\,y-U(a)\in[x2^k,x2^{k+1})}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left|\int_{U(a)}^{y}\left(\frac{1}{\Phi_n(s;\hat\beta_n)}-\frac{1}{\Phi(s;\beta_0)}\right)\mathrm{d}H_n^{uc}(s)\right|^3\right]\\ &\quad\le\frac{C^3}{n}\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\Delta_i\mathbb{1}_{\{T_i\in[U(a),(U(a)+x2^{k+1})\wedge M)]\}}\right)^3\right]\le\frac{C^3}{n^4}\mathbb{E}[N^3],\end{aligned}$$

where N is a binomial distribution with probability of success

$$\gamma=H^{uc}((U(a)+x2^{k+1})\wedge M))-H^{uc}(U(a))\le\sup_{s\in[0,M]}|h^{uc}(s)|x2^{k+1}.$$

Furthermore,

$$\mathbb{E}[N^3]=n\gamma(1-3\gamma+3n\gamma+2\gamma^2-3n\gamma^2+n^2\gamma^2)\le\begin{cases}7n\gamma & \text{, if } n\gamma\le 1;\\ 7n^3\gamma^3 & \text{, if } n\gamma>1.\end{cases}$$

Using Lemma 5.2 and the bound in (48), for the first probability on the right hand side of (47), it follows that there exist $K_1, K_2 > 0$, such that for all $a \geq 0$, $n \geq 1$ and $x > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{U(a) + x \leq \tilde{U}_n(a) \leq M\right\} \cap E_n\right) \\
&\quad \leq K_1 \sum_{k=0}^{i} \frac{x 2^{k+1}}{n x^4 2^{4k}} + K_2 \sum_{k=0}^{i} \max\left\{\frac{x 2^{k+1}}{n^3 x^6 2^{6k}}, \frac{x^3 2^{3(k+1)}}{n x^6 2^{6k}}\right\} \\
&\quad \leq \frac{2K_1}{nx^3} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{-3k} + \max\left\{\frac{2K_2}{n^3 x^5} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{-5k}, \frac{8K_2}{nx^3} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{-3k}\right\} \leq K \max\left\{\frac{1}{nx^3}, \frac{1}{n^3 x^5}\right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

We proceed with the second probability on the right hand side of (47). We can assume $x \leq U(a)$, because otherwise $\mathbb{P}\big(\tilde{U}_n(a) \leq U(a) - x\big) = 0$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\tilde{U}_n(a) \leq U(a) - x\right\} \cap E_n\right) \\
&\quad \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\inf_{y \in [0, U(a)-x]} \left[\Lambda_n(y) - ay - \Lambda_n(U(a)) + a\, U(a)\right] \leq 0\right\} \cap E_n\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Let $i \geq 0$ be such that $U(a) \in [x2^i, x2^{i+1})$. By a similar argument used to obtain the bound (48), this probability is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
&4 \sum_{k=0}^{i} \left(c^2 x^4 2^{4k}\right)^{-1} \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{y \leq U(a), U(a)-y \in [x2^k, x2^{k+1})} \left|\mathbb{B}_n(y) - \mathbb{B}_n(U(a))\right|^2\right] \\
&\quad + 8 \sum_{k=0}^{i} \left(c^3 x^6 2^{6k}\right)^{-1} \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{y \leq U(a), U(a)-y \in [x2^k, x2^{k+1})} \mathbb{1}_{E_n} \left|R_n(y) - R_n(U(a))\right|^3\right].
\end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

In the same way as in the first case, we also have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{y \leq U(a), U(a)-y \in [x2^k, x2^{k+1})} \mathbb{1}_{E_n} \left|R_n(y) - R_n(U(a))\right|^3\right] \leq K_2 \max\left\{\frac{x 2^{k+1}}{n^3}, \frac{x^3 2^{3(k+1)}}{n}\right\}.$$

Exactly as in (52), Lemma 5.2 and (53) imply that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\tilde{U}_n(a) \leq U(a) - x\right\} \cap E_n\right) \leq K \max\left\{\frac{1}{nx^3}, \frac{1}{n^3 x^5}\right\},$$

for some positive constant K. Together with (47) and (52), this finishes the proof. □

Lemma 5.4. *Let $0 < \epsilon < M' < M < \tau_H$ and suppose that H^{uc}, defined in (1), has a bounded derivative h^{uc} on $[0, M]$. Let $\tilde{\lambda}_n$ be the Grenander-type estimator of a nondecreasing baseline hazard rate λ_0, which is differentiable with λ_0' bounded above and below by strictly positive constants. Let E_n be the event from Lemma 3.1 and take ξ_3 in (38) such that*

$$0 < \xi_3 < \frac{1}{8} \min\left\{(M - M')^2, \epsilon^2\right\} \inf_{x \in [0, \tau_H]} \lambda_0'(x). \tag{54}$$

Then, there exists a constant C such that, for n sufficiently large,

$$\sup_{t\in[\epsilon,M']} \mathbb{E}\left[n^{2/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left(\lambda_0(t)-\tilde{\lambda}_n(t)\right)^2\right] \leq C.$$

Proof. It is sufficient to prove that there exist some constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$, such that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and each $t \in (\epsilon, M']$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[n^{2/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left\{(\tilde{\lambda}_n(t)-\lambda_0(t))_+\right\}^2\right] \leq C_1, \tag{55}$$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[n^{2/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left\{(\lambda_0(t)-\tilde{\lambda}_n(t))_+\right\}^2\right] \leq C_2. \tag{56}$$

Lets first consider (55). We will make use of the following result

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[n^{2/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left\{(\tilde{\lambda}_n(t)-\lambda_0(t))_+\right\}^2\right] &= 2\int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}\left(n^{1/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}(\tilde{\lambda}_n(t)-\lambda_0(t)) \geq x\right) x\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&= 2\int_0^{2\eta} \mathbb{P}\left(n^{1/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}(\tilde{\lambda}_n(t)-\lambda_0(t)) \geq x\right) x\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\quad + 2\int_{2\eta}^\infty \mathbb{P}\left(n^{1/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}(\tilde{\lambda}_n(t)-\lambda_0(t)) \geq x\right) x\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\leq 4\eta^2 + 2\int_{2\eta}^\infty \mathbb{P}\left(n^{1/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}(\tilde{\lambda}_n(t)-\lambda_0(t)) > x/2\right) x\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&\leq 4\eta^2 + 4\int_{\eta}^\infty \mathbb{P}\left(n^{1/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}(\tilde{\lambda}_n(t)-\lambda_0(t)) > x\right) x\,\mathrm{d}x
\end{aligned}$$

for a fixed $\eta > 0$. We distinguish between the cases $a + n^{-1/3}x \leq \lambda_0(M)$ and $a + n^{-1/3}x > \lambda_0(M)$, where $a = \lambda_0(t)$. We prove that, in the first case, there exist a positive constant C such that for all $t \in (\epsilon, M']$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbb{P}\big(n^{1/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}(\tilde{\lambda}_n(t)-\lambda_0(t)) > x\big) \leq C/x^3$, for all $x \geq \eta$, and in the second case $\mathbb{P}\big(n^{1/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}(\tilde{\lambda}_n(t)-\lambda_0(t)) > x\big) = 0$. Then (55) follows immediately.

First, assume $a + n^{-1/3}x \leq \lambda_0(M)$. By the switching relation, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(n^{1/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}(\tilde{\lambda}_n(t)-\lambda_0(t)) > x\right) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\tilde{\lambda}_n(t) > a + n^{-1/3}x\right\} \cap E_n\right) \\
&= \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\tilde{U}_n(a + n^{-1/3}x) < t\right\} \cap E_n\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Because $a + n^{-1/3}x \leq \lambda_0(M)$, we have $U(a + n^{-1/3}x) \geq M > t$. Furthermore, $\{\tilde{U}_n(a + n^{-1/3}x) < t\} \subset \{\tilde{U}_n(a + n^{-1/3}x) < M\}$. Hence, together with Lemma 5.3, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\tilde{U}_n(a+n^{-1/3}x) < t\right\} \cap E_n\right) \\
&\quad \leq \mathbb{P}\Bigg(\left\{\left|U(a+n^{-1/3}x) - \tilde{U}_n(a+n^{-1/3}x)\right| > U(a+n^{-1/3}x) - t\right\} \\
&\qquad\qquad \cap E_n \cap \left\{\tilde{U}_n(a+n^{-1/3}x) < M\right\}\Bigg) \\
&\quad \leq K \max\left\{\frac{1}{n\big(U(a+n^{-1/3}x)-t\big)^3}, \frac{1}{n^3\big(U(a+n^{-1/3}x)-t\big)^5}\right\} \leq \frac{C}{x^3},
\end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

because $U(a + n^{-1/3}x) - t = U'(\xi_n)n^{-1/3}x$, for some $\xi_n \in (a, a + n^{-1/3}x)$, where $U'(\xi_n) = \lambda_0'(\lambda_0^{-1}(\xi_n))^{-1} \geq 1/\sup_{t\in[0,\tau_H]} \lambda_0'(t) > 0$.

Next, consider the case $a + n^{-1/3}x > \lambda_0(M)$. Note that, we cannot argue as in the previous case, because for $a+n^{-1/3}x > \lambda_0(M)$ we always have $U(a+n^{-1/3}x) = M$, so that we loose the dependence on x. However, if $n^{1/3}(\tilde{\lambda}_n(t) - \lambda_0(t)) > x$, then for each $y > t$, we have

$$\tilde{\Lambda}_n(y) - \tilde{\Lambda}_n(t) \geq \tilde{\lambda}_n(t)\,(y-t) > (a + n^{-1/3}x)\,(y-t),$$

where $a = \lambda_0(t)$. In particular for $y = \tilde{M} = M' + (M - M')/2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left\{n^{1/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}(\tilde{\lambda}_n(t) - \lambda_0(t)) > x\right\} \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\tilde{\Lambda}_n(\tilde{M}) - \tilde{\Lambda}_n(t) > \big(a + n^{-1/3}x\big)\,(\tilde{M} - t)\right\} \cap E_n\right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\Bigg(\Bigg\{\tilde{\Lambda}_n(\tilde{M}) - \tilde{\Lambda}_n(t) - \big(\Lambda_0(\tilde{M}) - \Lambda_0(t)\big) > \\
&\qquad\qquad \big(a + n^{-1/3}x\big)\,(\tilde{M} - t) - \big(\Lambda_0(\tilde{M}) - \Lambda_0(t)\big)\Bigg\} \cap E_n\Bigg) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{2\sup_{x\in[0,M]} |\tilde{\Lambda}_n(x) - \Lambda_0(x)| > \Big(a + n^{-1/3}x - \lambda_0(\tilde{M})\Big)\,(\tilde{M} - t)\right\} \cap E_n\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

also using that $\Lambda_0(\tilde{M}) - \Lambda_0(t) \geq \lambda_0(\tilde{M})(\tilde{M} - t)$. Furthermore, since $a + n^{-1/3}x > \lambda_0(M)$, it follows from (54) that

$$\Big(a + n^{-1/3}x - \lambda_0(\tilde{M})\Big)\,(\tilde{M} - t) \geq \frac{1}{4}(M - M')^2 \inf_{x\in[0,\tau_H]} \lambda_0'(x) \geq 2\xi_3, \tag{59}$$

so that, by the definition of ξ_3 in (38), the probability on the right hand side (58) is zero. This concludes the proof of (55).

Next, we have to deal with (56). Arguing as in the proof of (55), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\left[n^{2/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left\{(\lambda_0(t)-\tilde\lambda_n(t))_+\right\}^2\right] \le \eta^2 + 2\int_\eta^\infty \mathbb{P}\left(n^{1/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}(\lambda_0(t)-\tilde\lambda_n(t)) \ge x\right) x\,\mathrm{d}x,$$

for a fixed $\eta > 0$, where

$$\mathbb{P}\left(n^{1/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}(\lambda_0(t)-\tilde\lambda_n(t)) \ge x\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\tilde U_n(a-n^{-1/3}x) \ge t\right\} \cap E_n\right),$$

with $a = \lambda_0(t)$. First of all, we can assume that $a - n^{-1/3}x \ge 0$, because otherwise $\mathbb{P}\{\tilde\lambda_n(t) \le a - n^{-1/3}x\} = 0$. Since $t = U(a)$, as before, we write

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\tilde U_n(a-n^{-1/3}x) \ge t\right\} \cap E_n\right)\\ &\quad\le \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\left|\tilde U_n(a-n^{-1/3}x) - U(a-n^{-1/3}x)\right| \ge t - U(a-n^{-1/3}x)\right\} \cap E_n\right).\end{aligned}$$

In order to apply Lemma 5.3, we intersect with the event $\tilde U_n(a-n^{-1/3}x) \le M$. Note that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\tilde U_n(a-n^{-1/3}x) > M\right\} \cap E_n\right) \le \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\tilde\lambda_n(M) \le a - n^{-1/3}x\right\} \cap E_n\right) = 0.$$

This can be seen as follows. If $\tilde\lambda_n(M) \le a - n^{-1/3}x$, then for each $y < M$, we have

$$\tilde\Lambda_n(M) - \tilde\Lambda_n(y) \le \tilde\lambda_n(M)(M-y) \le (a-n^{-1/3}x)(M-y).$$

In particular for $y = \tilde M = M' + (M-M')/2$, similar to (58), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\tilde\lambda_n(M) \le a - n^{-1/3}x\right\} \cap E_n\right)\\ &\quad\le \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{2\sup_{x\in[0,M]}|\tilde\Lambda_n(x)-\Lambda_0(x)| \ge \left(-a + n^{-1/3}x + \lambda_0(\tilde M)\right)\left(M-\tilde M\right)\right\} \cap E_n\right).\end{aligned}$$

Because $a = \lambda_0(t) \le \lambda_0(M')$, we can argue as in (59) and conclude that the probability on the right hand side is zero. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\tilde U_n(a-n^{-1/3}x) \ge t\right\} \cap E_n\right)\\ &\quad\le \mathbb{P}\Bigg(\left\{\left|\tilde U_n(a-n^{-1/3}x) - U(a-n^{-1/3}x)\right| \ge t - U(a-n^{-1/3}x)\right\}\\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \cap E_n \cap \left\{\tilde U_n(a-n^{-1/3}x) \le M\right\}\Bigg)\\ &\quad\le K\max\left\{\frac{1}{n\big(t-U(a-n^{-1/3}x)\big)^3}, \frac{1}{n^3\big(t-U(a-n^{-1/3}x)\big)^5}\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

To bound the right hand side, we have to distinguish between $a - n^{-1/3}x > \lambda_0(0)$ and $a - n^{-1/3}x \le \lambda_0(0)$. If $a - n^{-1/3}x > \lambda_0(0)$, then the right hand side is bounded by K/x^3, because $t - U(a-n^{-1/3}x) = U'(\xi_n)n^{-1/3}x$, for some $\xi_n \in (a-n^{-1/3}x, a)$, where $U'(\xi_n) = \lambda_0'(\lambda_0^{-1}(\xi_n))^{-1} \ge 1/\sup_{t\in[0,\tau_H]}\lambda_0'(t) > 0$. Otherwise, if $a - n^{-1/3}x \le \lambda_0(0)$, then

we are done because then $\mathbb{P}\big(n^{1/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}(\lambda_0(t)-\tilde{\lambda}_n(t))\geq x\big)=0$. This can be seen as follows. When $a-n^{-1/3}x\leq\lambda_0(0)$, then for each $y<t$, we have

$$\tilde{\Lambda}_n(t)-\tilde{\Lambda}_n(y)\leq\tilde{\lambda}_n(t)(t-y)\leq(a-n^{-1/3}x)(t-y).$$

In particular, for $y=\epsilon'=\epsilon/2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(n^{1/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left(\lambda_0(t)-\tilde{\lambda}_n(t)\right)\geq x\right)\\
&\leq\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\tilde{\Lambda}_n(t)-\tilde{\Lambda}_n(\epsilon')\leq\left(a-n^{-1/3}x\right)(t-\epsilon')\right\}\cap E_n\right)\\
&\leq\mathbb{P}\Bigg(\Bigg\{\tilde{\Lambda}_n(t)-\tilde{\Lambda}_n(\epsilon')-(\Lambda_0(t)-\Lambda_0(\epsilon'))\\
&\qquad\qquad\leq\left(a-n^{-1/3}x\right)(t-\epsilon')-(\Lambda_0(t)-\Lambda_0(\epsilon'))\Bigg\}\cap E_n\Bigg)\\
&\leq\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{2\sup_{x\in[0,M]}|\tilde{\Lambda}_n(x)-\Lambda_0(x)|\geq\left(-a+n^{-1/3}x\right)(t-\epsilon')+\lambda_0(\epsilon')(t-\epsilon')\right\}\cap E_n\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Because $a-n^{-1/3}x\leq\lambda_0(0)$, we can argue as in (59),

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(-a+n^{-1/3}x+\lambda_0(\epsilon')\right)(t-\epsilon')&\geq(\lambda_0(\epsilon')-\lambda_0(0))(\epsilon-\epsilon')\\
&\geq\frac{1}{4}\epsilon^2\inf_{x\in[0,\tau_H]}\lambda_0'(x)\geq 2\xi_3.
\end{aligned}\tag{60}$$

and conclude that the probability on the right hand side is zero. This concludes the proof of (56). □

Lemma 5.5. *Fix $x\in(0,\tau_h)$. Let $0<\epsilon<x<M'<M<\tau_H$ and suppose that H^{uc}, defined in (1), has a bounded derivative h^{uc} on $[0,M]$. Let $\tilde{\lambda}_n$ be the Grenander-type estimator of a nondecreasing baseline hazard rate λ_0, which is differentiable with λ_0' bounded above and below by strictly positive constants. Let E_n be the event from Lemma 3.1 and assume that ξ_3 satisfies (54). Then*

$$\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\int_{x-b}^{x+b}(\lambda_0(t)-\tilde{\lambda}_n(t))^2\mathrm{d}t=O_p(bn^{-2/3}).$$

Proof. Markov's inequality and Fubini, yield

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(b^{-1}n^{2/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\int_{x-b}^{x+b}(\lambda_0(t)-\tilde{\lambda}_n(t))^2\,\mathrm{d}t>K\right)\\
&\leq\frac{1}{K}\mathbb{E}\left[b^{-1}n^{2/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\int_{x-b}^{x+b}(\lambda_0(t)-\tilde{\lambda}_n(t))^2\,\mathrm{d}t\right]\\
&\leq\frac{2}{K}\sup_{t\in[x-b,x+b]}\mathbb{E}\left[n^{2/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}(\lambda_0(t)-\tilde{\lambda}_n(t))^2\right].
\end{aligned}$$

For n sufficiently large $[x-b, x+b] \subset [\epsilon, M']$, so that according to Lemma 5.4, the right hand side is bounded by $2C/K$, for some constant $C > 0$. This proves the lemma. □

Proof of Lemma 3.3. Take $x < M < \tau_H$ and n sufficiently large such that $x + b \leq M$. With $\overline{a}_{n,x}\overline{\Phi}_n$ defined in (15), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int \left\{\overline{\theta}_{n,x}(u,\delta,z) - \theta_{n,x}(u,\delta,z)\right\} \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(u,\delta,z) \\
&\quad = \mathbb{1}_{E_n} \int \mathbb{1}_{[x-b,x+b]}(u)\delta \left(\frac{\overline{a}_{n,x}\overline{\Phi}_n(u;\hat{\beta}_n)}{\Phi_n(u;\hat{\beta}_n)} - a_{n,x}(u) \right) \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(u,\delta,z) \\
&\qquad - \mathbb{1}_{E_n} \int \mathrm{e}^{\hat{\beta}_n' z} \int_0^u \left(\overline{\Psi}_{n,x}(v) - a_{n,x}(v)\right) \mathrm{d}\tilde{\Lambda}_n(v) \, \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(u,\delta,z) \\
&\quad = \mathbb{1}_{E_n} \int_{x-b}^{x+b} \left(\frac{\overline{a}_{n,x}\overline{\Phi}_n(u;\hat{\beta}_n)}{\Phi_n(u;\hat{\beta}_n)} - a_{n,x}(u) \right) \mathrm{d}H^{uc}(u) \\
&\qquad - \mathbb{1}_{E_n} \int_{x-b}^{x+b} \left(\frac{\overline{a}_{n,x}\overline{\Phi}_n(v;\hat{\beta}_n)}{\Phi_n(v;\hat{\beta}_n)} - a_{n,x}(v) \right) \Phi(v;\hat{\beta}_n) \, \mathrm{d}\tilde{\Lambda}_n(v)
\end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

using Fubini, the definition (2) of Φ, and the fact that $\overline{a}_{n,x}\overline{\Phi}_n$ and $a_{n,x}$ are zero outside $[x-b, x+b]$. Write $\widehat{\Phi}_n(u) = \Phi_n(u;\hat{\beta}_n)$, $\widehat{\Phi}(u) = \Phi(u;\hat{\beta}_n)$, and $\Phi_0(u) = \Phi(u;\beta_0)$. Then the right hand side can be written as

$$\mathbb{1}_{E_n} \int_{x-b}^{x+b} \frac{a_{n,x}(\hat{A}_n(u))\widehat{\Phi}_n(\hat{A}_n(u)) - a_{n,x}(u)\widehat{\Phi}_n(u)}{\widehat{\Phi}_n(u)} \left(\Phi_0(u)\lambda_0(u) - \widehat{\Phi}(u)\tilde{\lambda}_n(u) \right) \mathrm{d}u$$

where $\hat{A}_n(u)$ is defined in (16). The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality then yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \int \left\{\overline{\theta}_{n,x}(u,\delta,z) - \theta_{n,x}(u,\delta,z)\right\} \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(u,\delta,z) \right| \\
&\leq \mathbb{1}_{E_n} \left\| \frac{(a_{n,x} \circ \hat{A}_n)(\widehat{\Phi}_n \circ \hat{A}_n) - a_{n,x}\widehat{\Phi}_n}{\widehat{\Phi}_n} \mathbb{1}_{[x-b,x+b]} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}_2} \left\| \left(\Phi_0\lambda_0 - \widehat{\Phi}\tilde{\lambda}_n \right) \mathbb{1}_{[x-b,x+b]} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}_2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

Furthermore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{1}_{E_n} \left\| \frac{(a_{n,x} \circ \hat{A}_n)(\widehat{\Phi}_n \circ \hat{A}_n) - a_{n,x}\widehat{\Phi}_n}{\widehat{\Phi}_n} \mathbb{1}_{[x-b,x+b]} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}_2} \\
&\leq 2\mathbb{1}_{E_n} \int_{x-b}^{x+b} \left(\frac{k_b(x - \hat{A}_{n,x}(u))}{\Phi_0(\hat{A}_n(u))} - \frac{k_b(x-u)}{\Phi_0(u)} \right)^2 \mathrm{d}u \\
&\qquad + 2\mathbb{1}_{E_n} \int_{x-b}^{x+b} \left(\frac{k_b(x - \hat{A}_n(u))}{\Phi_0(\hat{A}_n(u))} \right)^2 \frac{\left(\widehat{\Phi}_n(\hat{A}_n(u)) - \widehat{\Phi}_n(u) \right)^2}{\widehat{\Phi}_n(u)^2} \, \mathrm{d}u \\
&\leq 2\mathbb{1}_{E_n} \int_{x-b}^{x+b} \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}y} \frac{k_b(x-y)}{\Phi_0(y)} \Big|_{y=\xi_u} \right)^2 \left(\hat{A}_n(u) - u \right)^2 \mathrm{d}u \\
&\qquad + \mathbb{1}_{E_n} \frac{c_1}{b^2 \widehat{\Phi}_n(M)^2} \int_{x-b}^{x+b} \left(\widehat{\Phi}_n(\hat{A}_n(u)) - \widehat{\Phi}_n(u) \right)^2 \mathrm{d}u \\
&\leq \mathbb{1}_{E_n} \frac{c_2}{b^4} \int_{x-b}^{x+b} \left(\hat{A}_n(u) - u \right)^2 \mathrm{d}u + \mathbb{1}_{E_n} \frac{c_1}{b^2 \widehat{\Phi}_n(M)^2} \int_{x-b}^{x+b} \left(\widehat{\Phi}_n(\hat{A}_n(u)) - \widehat{\Phi}_n(u) \right)^2 \mathrm{d}u,
\end{aligned}
\tag{63}
$$

for some constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$, where we use the boundedness of k', $\mathrm{d}\Phi(x;\beta_0)/\mathrm{d}x$ and $1/\Phi(x;\beta_0)$ on $[0, x+b] \subseteq [0, M]$. Then, since $\lambda_0(u) - \lambda_0(\hat{A}_n(u)) = \lambda_0'(\xi)(u - \hat{A}_n(u))$ and λ_0' is bounded and strictly positive on $[0, M] \supseteq [x-b, x+b]$, there exists a constant $K > 0$ such that

$$
|u - \hat{A}_n(u)| \leq K \, |\lambda_0(u) - \lambda_0(\hat{A}_n(u))|.
$$

If $u \in (\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}]$ and $\hat{A}_n(u) > \tau_i$, then $\tilde{\lambda}_n(u) = \tilde{\lambda}_n(\hat{A}_n(u))$ and we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
|u - \hat{A}_n(u)| &\leq K|\lambda_0(u) - \tilde{\lambda}_n(u)| + K|\tilde{\lambda}_n(\hat{A}_n(u)) - \lambda_0(\hat{A}_n(u))| \\
&\leq 2K|\lambda_0(u) - \tilde{\lambda}_n(u)|.
\end{aligned}
\tag{64}
$$

This holds also in the case $\hat{A}_n(u) = \tau_i$, simply because $|\lambda_0(u) - \lambda_0(\hat{A}_n(u))| \leq |\lambda_0(u) - \tilde{\lambda}_n(u)|$. As a result, using Lemma 5.5, for the first term on the right hand side of (63), we derive that

$$
\mathbb{1}_{E_n} \frac{1}{b^4} \int_{x-b}^{x+b} \left(\hat{A}_n(u) - u \right)^2 \mathrm{d}u \leq \frac{C}{b^4} \mathbb{1}_{E_n} \int_{x-b}^{x+b} \left(\lambda_0(u) - \tilde{\lambda}_n(u) \right)^2 \mathrm{d}u = O_p(b^{-3} n^{-2/3}). \tag{65}
$$

For the second term on the right hand side of (63), we find

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\Phi_n(\hat{A}_n(u);\hat{\beta}_n)-\Phi_n(u;\hat{\beta}_n)\right| &\le 2\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}\left|\Phi_n(x;\hat{\beta}_n)-\Phi_n(x;\beta_0)\right|+\left|\Phi(\hat{A}_n(u);\beta_0)-\Phi(u;\beta_0)\right|\\ &\quad+2\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}|\Phi_n(x;\beta_0)-\Phi(x;\beta_0)|\\ &\le 2|\hat{\beta}_n-\beta_0|\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}\left|D_n^{(1)}(x;\beta^*)\right|+|\Phi'(\xi;\beta_0)||\hat{A}_n(u)-u|\\ &\quad+2\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}|\Phi_n(x;\beta_0)-\Phi(x;\beta_0)|,\end{aligned}$$

which, using (37), (5) and $|\hat{\beta}_n-\beta_0|=O_p(n^{-1/2})$ (see Theorem 3.2 in [32]), leads to

$$\begin{aligned}&b^{-2}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\int_{x-b}^{x+b}\left(\Phi_n(\hat{A}_n(u);\hat{\beta}_n)-\Phi_n(u;\hat{\beta}_n)\right)^2\,\mathrm{d}u\\ &\le 8b^{-1}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}|\hat{\beta}_n-\beta_0|^2\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}\left|D_n^{(1)}(x;\beta^*)\right|^2\\ &\quad+2b^{-2}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\sup_{s\in[x-b,x+b]}\Phi'(s;\beta_0)\int_{x-b}^{x+b}\left(\hat{A}_n(u)-u\right)^2\,\mathrm{d}u\\ &\quad+8b^{-1}\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}|\Phi_n(x;\beta_0)-\Phi(x;\beta_0)|^2\\ &=O_p(b^{-1}n^{-1})+O_p(b^{-1}n^{-2/3})+O_p(b^{-1}n^{-1})=O_p(b^{-1}n^{-2/3}).\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, from (63) together with (51), for the first term on the right hand side of (62), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left\|\frac{(a_{n,x}\circ\hat{A}_n)(\widehat{\Phi}_n\circ\hat{A}_n)-a_{n,x}\widehat{\Phi}_n}{\widehat{\Phi}_n}\mathbb{1}_{[x-b,x+b]}\right\|_{\mathcal{L}_2}^2 &=O_p(b^{-3}n^{-2/3})+O_p(b^{-1}n^{-2/3})\\ &=O_p(b^{-3}n^{-2/3}).\end{aligned}$$

For the second term on the right hand side of (62), we first write

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\left(\Phi_0\lambda_0-\widehat{\Phi}\tilde{\lambda}_n\right)\mathbb{1}_{[x-b,x+b]}\right\|_{\mathcal{L}_2}\\ &\le\left\|\left(\Phi_0-\widehat{\Phi}\right)\lambda_0\mathbb{1}_{[x-b,x+b]}\right\|_{\mathcal{L}_2}+\left\|\left(\lambda_0-\tilde{\lambda}_n\right)\widehat{\Phi}\mathbb{1}_{[x-b,x+b]}\right\|_{\mathcal{L}_2}\end{aligned}\tag{66}$$

On the event E_n, we find

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left\|\left(\Phi_0-\widehat{\Phi}\right)\lambda_0\mathbb{1}_{[x-b,x+b]}\right\|_{\mathcal{L}_2}^2 &\le 2b\mathbb{1}_{E_n}|\hat{\beta}_n-\beta_0|^2\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}\left|D_n^{(1)}(x;\beta^*)\right|^2\sup_{u\in[0,M]}\lambda_0(u)\\ &=O_p(bn^{-1}),\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left\|\left(\lambda_0-\tilde{\lambda}_n\right)\widehat{\Phi}\mathbb{1}_{[x-b,x+b]}\right\|_{\mathcal{L}_2}^2\le\Phi(0,\hat{\beta}_n)\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\int_{x-b}^{x+b}\left(\lambda_0(u)-\tilde{\lambda}_n(u)\right)^2\,\mathrm{d}u=O_p(bn^{-2/3}),$$

due to Lemma 5.5. It follows that

$$\mathbb{1}_{E_n} \left\| \left(\Phi_0 \lambda_0 - \widehat{\Phi} \tilde{\lambda}_n \right) \mathbb{1}_{[x-b,x+b]} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}_2} = O_p(b^{1/2} n^{-1/3}).$$

Together with (62), this concludes the proof. □

To establish Lemma 3.4, we need a slightly stronger version of Lemma 5.4. Note that, in order to have the uniform result in (67), we loose a factor $n^{2/9}$ with respect to the bound in Lemma 5.4. This might not be optimal, but it is sufficient for our purposes.

Lemma 5.6. *Let $0 < \epsilon < M' < M < \tau_H$ and suppose that H^{uc}, defined in (1), has a bounded derivative h^{uc} on $[0, M]$. Let $\tilde{\lambda}_n$ be the Grenander-type estimator of a nondecreasing baseline hazard rate λ_0, which is differentiable with λ_0' bounded above and below by strictly positive constants. Let E_n be the event from Lemma 3.1 and assume that ξ_3 satisfies (54). Then, there exists a constant $C > 0$, such that, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[n^{4/9} \mathbb{1}_{E_n} \sup_{t \in (\epsilon, M']} \left(\lambda_0(t) - \tilde{\lambda}_n(t) \right)^2 \right] \leq C. \tag{67}$$

Proof of Lemma 5.6. We decompose $(\epsilon, M']$ in m intervals $(c_k, c_{k+1}]$, where $c_k = \epsilon + k(M' - \epsilon)/m$,for $k = 0, 1, \ldots, m$, and $m = (M' - \epsilon) n^{2/9}$. Then, we have

$$\sup_{t \in (\epsilon, M']} \left(\lambda_0(t) - \tilde{\lambda}_n(t) \right)^2 = \max_{0 \leq k \leq m-1} \sup_{t \in (c_k, c_{k+1}]} \left(\lambda_0(t) - \tilde{\lambda}_n(t) \right)^2.$$

On the other hand, the fact that λ_0 is differentiable with bounded derivative implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{t \in (c_k, c_{k+1}]} \left(\lambda_0(t) - \tilde{\lambda}_n(t) \right)^2 \\
&\quad \leq 2 \sup_{t \in (c_k, c_{k+1}]} \left(\lambda_0(t) - \lambda_0(c_{k+1}) \right)^2 + 2 \sup_{t \in (c_k, c_{k+1}]} \left(\lambda_0(c_{k+1}) - \tilde{\lambda}_n(t) \right)^2 \\
&\quad \leq 2 \left(\sup_{u \in [0, M']} \lambda_0'(u) \right)^2 \left(c_k - c_{k+1} \right)^2 \\
&\qquad\quad + 2 \max \left\{ \left(\lambda_0(c_{k+1}) - \tilde{\lambda}_n(c_k) \right)^2, \left(\lambda_0(c_{k+1}) - \tilde{\lambda}_n(c_{k+1}) \right)^2 \right\} \\
&\quad \leq 2 \left(\sup_{u \in [0, M']} \lambda_0'(u) \right)^2 \frac{(M' - \epsilon)^2}{m^2} \\
&\qquad\quad + \max_{0 \leq k \leq m} \left(\lambda_0(c_k) - \tilde{\lambda}_n(c_k) \right)^2 + \max_{0 \leq k \leq m-1} \left(\lambda_0(c_{k+1}) - \lambda_0(c_k) \right)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we used that $\tilde{\lambda}_n$ is non-decreasing, and therefore $\sup_{t\in(c_k,c_{k+1}]}\big(\lambda_0(c_{k+1})-\tilde{\lambda}_n(t)\big)^2$ is achieved either at $t=c_k$ or $t=c_{k+1}$, for $k=0,1,\ldots,m-1$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{t\in(\epsilon,M']}\big(\lambda_0(t)-\tilde{\lambda}_n(t)\big)^2 &\le 4\max_{0\le k\le m}\big(\lambda_0(c_k)-\tilde{\lambda}_n(c_k)\big)^2+6\left(\sup_{u\in[0,M']}\lambda_0'(u)\right)^2\frac{(M'-\epsilon)^2}{m^2}\\ &\le 4\max_{0\le k\le m}\big(\lambda_0(c_k)-\tilde{\lambda}_n(c_k)\big)^2+C_1n^{-4/9},\end{aligned}$$

where $C_1=6\big(\sup_{u\in[\epsilon,M']}\lambda_0'(u)\big)^2$. Consequently, using Lemma 5.4, we derive

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[n^{4/9}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\sup_{t\in(\epsilon,M']}\big(\lambda_0(t)-\tilde{\lambda}_n(t)\big)^2\right] &\le 4\mathbb{E}\left[n^{4/9}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\max_{0\le k\le m}\big(\lambda_0(c_k)-\tilde{\lambda}_n(c_k)\big)^2\right]+C_1\\ &\le 4n^{-2/9}\sum_{k=0}^{m}\mathbb{E}\left[n^{2/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\big(\lambda_0(c_k)-\tilde{\lambda}_n(c_k)\big)^2\right]+C_1\\ &\le 4\,(M'-\epsilon+1)\,C+C_1.\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of (67). □

Proof of Lemma 3.4. Let n be sufficiently large such that $x+b\le M'<M<\tau_H$. Denote by R_n the left hand side of (24). Write $\mathbb{G}_n=\sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n-\mathbb{P})$ and decompose $R_n=R_{n1}+R_{n2}$, where

$$\begin{aligned}R_{n1}&=n^{-1/2}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\int\frac{\delta\mathbb{1}_{[x-b,x+b]}(u)}{\Phi_n(u;\hat{\beta}_n)}\Big(\bar{a}_{n,x}\bar{\Phi}_n(u;\hat{\beta}_n)-a_{n,x}(u)\Phi_n(u;\hat{\beta}_n)\Big)\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{G}_n(u,\delta,z),\\ R_{n2}&=n^{-1/2}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\int\mathbb{1}_{\{u>x-b\}}\Bigg[e^{\hat{\beta}_n'z}\int_{x-b}^{u\wedge(x+b)}\frac{\bar{a}_{n,x}\bar{\Phi}_n(v;\hat{\beta}_n)}{\Phi_n(v;\hat{\beta}_n)}\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{\Lambda}_n(v)\\ &\qquad\qquad-\mathrm{e}^{\beta_0'z}\int_{x-b}^{u\wedge(x+b)}a_{n,x}(v)\,\mathrm{d}\Lambda_0(v)\Bigg]\mathrm{d}\mathbb{G}_n(u,\delta,z).\end{aligned}$$

Choose $\eta>0$. We prove separately that there exists $\nu>0$, such that

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{P}\left(b^{3/2}n^{13/18}|R_{n1}|>\nu\right)&\le\eta\\ \limsup_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{P}\left(n^{1/2}|R_{n2}|>\nu\right)&\le\eta.\end{aligned}\tag{68}$$

We consider the following events.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_{n1}&=\left\{\tilde{\lambda}_n(M)>K_1\right\},\\ \mathcal{A}_{n2}&=\left\{\sup_{t\in[\epsilon,M']}\left|\lambda_0(t)-\tilde{\lambda}_n(t)\right|>K_2n^{-2/9}\right\},\end{aligned}\tag{69}$$

where $K_1,K_2>0$, and let $\mathcal{A}_n=\mathcal{A}_{n1}\cup\mathcal{A}_{n2}$. Since $\tilde{\lambda}_n(M)=O_p(1)$ we can choose $K_1>0$, such that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{n1})\le\eta/3$ and from Lemma 5.6 we find that we can choose $K_2>0$, such

that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{n2}) \leq \eta/3$, so that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_n) \leq 2\eta/3$. First consider R_{n1}. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(b^{3/2}n^{13/18}|R_{n1}| > \nu\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{A}_n\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{b^{3/2}n^{13/18}|R_{n1}| > \nu\right\} \cap \mathcal{A}_n^c\right) \\ &\leq 2\eta/3 + b^{3/2}n^{13/18}\nu^{-1}\mathbb{E}\left[|R_{n1}|\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_n^c}\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

It suffices to show that there exists $\nu > 0$, such that $b^{3/2}n^{13/18}\nu^{-1}\mathbb{E}\big[|R_{n1}|\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_n^c}\big] \leq \eta/3$, for all n sufficiently large. Write

$$\begin{aligned} w(u) &= \frac{1}{\Phi_n(u;\hat{\beta}_n)}\left(a_{n,x}(\hat{A}_n(u))\Phi_n(\hat{A}_n(u);\hat{\beta}_n) - a_{n,x}(u)\Phi_n(u;\hat{\beta}_n)\right) \\ &= \frac{a_{n,x}(\hat{A}_n(u))}{\Phi_n(u;\hat{\beta}_n)}\left(\Phi_n(\hat{A}_n(u);\hat{\beta}_n) - \Phi(\hat{A}_n(u);\beta_0)\right) + \frac{a_{n,x}(u)}{\Phi_n(u;\hat{\beta}_n)}\left(\Phi(u;\beta_0) - \Phi_n(u;\hat{\beta}_n)\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\Phi_n(u;\hat{\beta}_n)}\left(a_{n,x}(\hat{A}_n(u))\Phi(\hat{A}_n(u);\beta_0) - a_{n,x}(u)\Phi(u;\beta_0)\right). \end{aligned}$$

We will argue that the function $W_n = b^2n^{2/9}w$ is uniformly bounded and of bounded variation. Because of (50), $n^{1/3}(\Phi_n(\hat{A}_n(u);\hat{\beta}_n) - \Phi(\hat{A}_n(u);\beta_0))$ and $n^{1/3}(\Phi(u;\beta_0) - \Phi_n(u;\hat{\beta}_n))$ are uniformly bounded. Moreover, they are of bounded variation, as being the difference of two monotone functions. Similarly, $1/\Phi_n(u;\hat{\beta}_n)$ is of bounded variation and on the event E_n it is also uniformly bounded. Furthermore, by the definition of $a_{n,x}$, we have

$$a_{n,x}(\hat{A}_n(u))\Phi(\hat{A}_n(u);\beta_0) - a_{n,x}(u)\Phi(u;\beta_0) = k_b\left(x - \hat{A}_n(u)\right) - k_b(x-u).$$

This is a function of bounded variation, such that multiplied by $b^2n^{2/9}$ it is uniformly bounded on the event $\mathcal{A}_n^c$, because using (64), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left|k_b\left(x - \hat{A}_n(u)\right) - k_b(x-u)\right| &\leq b^{-2}|\hat{A}_n(u) - u| \sup_{x\in[-1,1]}|k'(x)| \\ &\leq 2Kb^{-2}|\tilde{\lambda}_n(u) - \lambda_0(u)| \sup_{x\in[-1,1]}|k'(x)| \\ &\leq b^{-2}n^{-2/9}2KK_2 \sup_{x\in[-1,1]}|k'(x)|. \end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

Finally, $ba_{n,x}(u) = bk_b(x-u)/\Phi(u;\beta_0)$ is also a function of bounded variation, as being the product of a function of bounded variation $bk_b(x-u)$ with the monotone function $1/\Phi(u;\beta_0)$, and it is uniformly bounded. Then, since $ba_{n,x}(\hat{A}_n(u))$ is the composition of an increasing function with a function of bounded variation that is uniformly bounded, it is also a function of bounded variation and uniformly bounded. As a result, being the sum and product of functions of bounded variation that are uniformly bounded, $W_n = b^2n^{2/9}w$ belongs to the class $\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{K}}$ of functions of bounded variation, uniformly bounded by some

constant $\tilde{K}$. Consequently, it holds

$$\begin{aligned} R_{n1} &= n^{-1/2}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\int \delta\mathbb{1}_{[x-b,x+b]}(u)w(u)\,\mathrm{d}\sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n-\mathbb{P})(u,\delta,z) \\ &= b^{-2}n^{-13/18}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\int \delta\mathbb{1}_{[x-b,x+b]}(u)W_n(u)\,\mathrm{d}\sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n-\mathbb{P})(u,\delta,z). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{K}}$ be the class of functions of bounded variation on $[0,M]$, that are uniformly bounded by $\tilde{K}>0$, and let $\mathcal{G}_n=\{\zeta_{B,n}: B\in\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{K}}\}$, where $\zeta_{B,n}(u,\delta)=\delta\mathbb{1}_{[x-b,x+b]}(u)B(u)$. Then, $\delta\mathbb{1}_{[x-b,x+b]}W_n$ is a member of the class $\mathcal{G}_n$, which has envelope $F_n(u,\delta)=\tilde{K}\delta\mathbb{1}_{[x-b,x+b]}(u)$. Furthermore, if $J(\delta,\mathcal{G}_n)$ is the corresponding entropy-integral (see Section 2.14 in [34]), then according to Lemma A.1 in [25], $J(\delta,\mathcal{G}_n)\le\int_0^\delta\sqrt{1+C/\epsilon}\,\mathrm{d}\epsilon$, for some $C>0$. Consequently, together with Theorem 2.14.1 in [34], we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[|R_{n1}|\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_n^c}\right] &\le b^{-2}n^{-13/18}\mathbb{E}\sup_{\zeta\in\mathcal{G}_n}\left|\int\zeta_{B,n}(u,\delta,z)\,\mathrm{d}\sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n-\mathbb{P})(u,\delta,z)\right| \\ &\le KJ(1,\mathcal{G}_n)\|F_n\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P})}b^{-2}n^{-13/18} \\ &\le K'\left(H^{uc}(x+b)-H^{uc}(x-b)\right)^{1/2}b^{-2}n^{-13/18}\le K''b^{-3/2}n^{-13/18}, \end{aligned}$$

because H^{uc} is absolutely continuous. As a result,

$$b^{3/2}n^{13/18}\nu^{-1}\mathbb{E}\left[|R_{n1}|\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_n^c}\right]\le\frac{K''}{\nu}\le\eta/3$$

for sufficiently large ν. This proves the first part of (68).

We proceed with R_{n2}. Similar to (70),

$$\mathbb{P}\left(n^{1/2}|R_{n2}|>\nu\right)\le 2\eta/3+n^{1/2}\nu^{-1}\mathbb{E}\left[|R_{n2}|\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_n^c}\right]. \tag{72}$$

and it suffices to show that there exists $\nu>0$, such that $n^{1/2}\nu^{-1}\mathbb{E}\big[|R_{n2}|\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_n^c}\big]\le\eta/3$, for all n sufficiently large. We write

$$n^{1/2}R_{n2}=\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\int\left(\mathrm{e}^{\hat{\beta}_n'z}r_{1,n}(u)-\mathrm{e}^{\beta_0'z}r_{2,n}(u)\right)\mathrm{d}\sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n-\mathbb{P})(u,\delta,z),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} r_{1,n}(u) &= \mathbb{1}_{\{u>x-b\}}\int_{x-b}^{u\wedge(x+b)}\frac{a_{n,x}(\hat{A}_n(v))}{\Phi_n(v;\hat{\beta}_n)}\Phi_n(\hat{A}_n(v);\hat{\beta}_n)\tilde{\lambda}_n(v)\,\mathrm{d}v, \\ r_{2,n}(u) &= \mathbb{1}_{\{u>x-b\}}\int_{x-b}^{u\wedge(x+b)}a_{n,x}(v)\,\lambda_0(v)\,\mathrm{d}v, \end{aligned}$$

are both monotone functions, uniformly bounded by some constant C on the event $\mathcal{A}_n^c\cap E_n$. Let $\mathcal{M}_C$ be the class of monotone functions bounded uniformly by $C>0$ and let $\mathcal{G}_n=\{\zeta_{r,\beta}(u,z): r\in\mathcal{M}_C,\beta\in\mathbb{R}^P,|\beta-\beta_0|\le\xi_2\}$, where ξ_2 is chosen as in (38) and

$\zeta_{r,\beta}(u,z) = r(u)\mathrm{e}^{\beta' z}$. Then $\mathrm{e}^{\hat{\beta}_n' z} r_{1,n}(u)$ is a member of the class $\mathcal{G}_n$, which has envelope

$$F_n(u,z) = C \exp\left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{p} (\beta_{0,j} - \sigma_n) z_j \vee (\beta_{0,j} + \sigma_n) z_j \right\},$$

with $\sigma_n = \sqrt{\xi_2 n^{-2/3}}$ is the envelope of $\mathcal{G}_n$. If $J_{[]}(\delta, \mathcal{G}_n, L_2(\mathbb{P}))$ is the bracketing integral (see Section 2.14 in [34]), then according to Lemma A.2 in [25], $J_{[]}(\delta, \mathcal{G}_n, L_2(\mathbb{P})) \leq \int_0^\delta \sqrt{1 + C/\epsilon}\, \mathrm{d}\epsilon$, for some $C > 0$. Hence, together with Theorem 2.14.2 in [34], we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\left| \mathbb{1}_{A_n^c \cap E_n} \int \mathrm{e}^{\hat{\beta}_n' z} r_{1,n}(u)\, \mathrm{d}\sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P})(u,\delta,z) \right| \right] \\
&\quad \leq \mathbb{E} \sup_{\zeta \in \mathcal{G}_n} \left| \int \zeta_{r,\beta}(u,z)\, \mathrm{d}\sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P})(u,\delta,z) \right| \\
&\quad \leq K J_{[]}(1, \mathcal{G}_n, L_2(\mathbb{P})) \|F_n\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P})} \leq K',
\end{aligned}$$

for some $K' > 0$. We conclude that,

$$\nu^{-1}\mathbb{E}\left[\left| \mathbb{1}_{A_n^c \cap E_n} \int \mathrm{e}^{\hat{\beta}_n' z} r_{1,n}(u)\, \mathrm{d}\sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P})(u,\delta,z) \right| \right] \leq \frac{K'}{\nu} \leq \eta/6,$$

for sufficiently large ν. In the same way, it can also be proved

$$\nu^{-1}\mathbb{E}\left[\left| \mathbb{1}_{A_n^c \cap E_n} \int \mathrm{e}^{\beta_0 z} r_{2,n}(u)\, \mathrm{d}\sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P})(u,\delta,z) \right| \right] \leq \frac{K}{\nu} \leq \eta/6$$

for sufficiently large ν, concluding the proof of (72) and therefore the second part of (68). □

References

[1] M. Banerjee. Estimating monotone, unimodal and U-shaped failure rates using asymptotic pivots. *Statist. Sinica*, 18(2):467–492, 2008.

[2] D. Burr. A comparison of certain bootstrap confidence intervals in the Cox model. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 89(428):1290–1302, 1994.

[3] M.-Y. Cheng, P. Hall, and D. Tu. Confidence bands for hazard rates under random censorship. *Biometrika*, 93(2):357–366, 2006.

[4] D. Chung and M. N. Chang. An isotonic estimator of the baseline hazard function in Cox's regression model under order restriction. *Statist. Probab. Lett.*, 21(3):223–228, 1994.

[5] D. R. Cox. Regression models and life-tables. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B*, 34:187–220, 1972. With discussion by F. Downton, Richard Peto, D. J. Bartholomew, D. V. Lindley, P. W. Glassborow, D. E. Barton, Susannah Howard, B. Benjamin, John J. Gart, L. D. Meshalkin, A. R. Kagan, M. Zelen, R. E. Barlow, Jack Kalbfleisch, R. L. Prentice and Norman Breslow, and a reply by D. R. Cox.

[6] D. R. Cox. Partial likelihood. *Biometrika*, 62(2):269–276, 1975.

[7] C. Durot. On the $\mathbb{L}_p$-error of monotonicity constrained estimators. *Ann. Statist.*, 35(3):1080–1104, 2007.

[8] C. Durot, P. Groeneboom, and H. P. Lopuhaä. Testing equality of functions under monotonicity constraints. *J. Nonparametr. Stat.*, 25(4):939–970, 2013.

[9] C. Durot, V. N. Kulikov, and H. P. Lopuhaä. The limit distribution of the L_∞-error of Grenander-type estimators. *Ann. Statist.*, 40(3):1578–1608, 2012.

[10] C. Durot and H. P. Lopuhaä. A Kiefer-Wolfowitz type of result in a general setting, with an application to smooth monotone estimation. *Electron. J. Stat.*, 8(2):2479–2513, 2014.
[11] B. Efron. The efficiency of Cox's likelihood function for censored data. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 72(359):557–565, 1977.
[12] P. P. B. Eggermont and V. N. LaRiccia. Maximum likelihood estimation of smooth monotone and unimodal densities. *Ann. Statist.*, 28(3):922–947, 2000.
[13] S. A. Geer. *Empirical Processes in M-estimation*, volume 6. Cambridge university press, 2000.
[14] R. D. Gill. Understanding Cox's regression model: a martingale approach. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 79(386):441–447, 1984.
[15] W. González-Manteiga, R. Cao, and J. S. Marron. Bootstrap selection of the smoothing parameter in nonparametric hazard rate estimation. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 91(435):1130–1140, 1996.
[16] P. Groeneboom and G. Jongbloed. Smooth and non-smooth estimates of a monotone hazard. In *From probability to statistics and back: high-dimensional models and processes*, volume 9 of *Inst. Math. Stat. (IMS) Collect.*, pages 174–196. Inst. Math. Statist., Beachwood, OH, 2013.
[17] P. Groeneboom and G. Jongbloed. *Nonparametric estimation under shape constraints*, volume 38. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
[18] P. Groeneboom and G. Jongbloed. Nonparametric confidence intervals for monotone functions. *Ann. Statist.*, 43(5):2019–2054, 2015.
[19] P. Groeneboom, G. Jongbloed, and B. I. Witte. Maximum smoothed likelihood estimation and smoothed maximum likelihood estimation in the current status model. *Ann. Statist.*, 38(1):352–387, 2010.
[20] P. Groeneboom and J. A. Wellner. *Information bounds and nonparametric maximum likelihood estimation*, volume 19 of *DMV Seminar*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1992.
[21] P. Hall. Effect of bias estimation on coverage accuracy of bootstrap confidence intervals for a probability density. *Ann. Statist.*, 20(2):675–694, 1992.
[22] J. D. Kalbfleisch and R. L. Prentice. *The statistical analysis of failure time data*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. Wiley-Interscience [John Wiley & Sons], Hoboken, NJ, second edition, 2002.
[23] H. P. Lopuhaä and E. Musta. Smooth estimation of a monotone hazard and a monotone density under random censoring. *Accepted by Statistica Neerlandica*, 2015.
[24] H. P. Lopuhaä and E. Musta. Isotonized smooth estimators of a monotone baseline hazard in the cox model. *Submitted*, 2016.
[25] H. P. Lopuhaä and E. Musta. Supplement to "smoothed isotonic estimators of a monotone baseline hazard in the cox model". 2016.
[26] H. P. Lopuhaä and G. F. Nane. Shape constrained non-parametric estimators of the baseline distribution in Cox proportional hazards model. *Scand. J. Stat.*, 40(3):619–646, 2013.
[27] E. Mammen. Estimating a smooth monotone regression function. *Ann. Statist.*, 19(2):724–740, 1991.
[28] H. Mukerjee. Monotone nonparameteric regression. *Ann. Statist.*, 16(2):741–750, 1988.
[29] G. F. Nane. *Shape Constrained Nonparametric Estimation in the Cox Model*. Delft University of Technology, 2013.
[30] J. O. Ramsay. Estimating smooth monotone functions. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.*, 60(2):365–375, 1998.
[31] G. R. Shorack and J. A. Wellner. *Empirical processes with applications to statistics*. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics: Probability and Mathematical Statistics. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1986.
[32] A. A. Tsiatis. A large sample study of Cox's regression model. *Ann. Statist.*, 9(1):93–108, 1981.
[33] A. W. van der Vaart and M. J. van der Laan. Smooth estimation of a monotone density. *Statistics*, 37(3):189–203, 2003.
[34] A. W. van der Vaart and J. A. Wellner. *Weak convergence and empirical processes*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996. With applications to statistics.

[35] N. van Geloven, I. Martin, P. Damman, R. J. de Winter, J. G. Tijssen, and H. P. Lopuhaä. Estimation of a decreasing hazard of patients with acute coronary syndrome. *Stat. Med.*, 32(7):1223–1238, 2013.
[36] G. Xu, B. Sen, and Z. Ying. Bootstrapping a change-point Cox model for survival data. *Electron. J. Stat.*, 8(1):1345–1379, 2014.
[37] S. Zhang and R. J. Karunamuni. On kernel density estimation near endpoints. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference*, 70(2):301–316, 1998.

Smoothed isotonic estimators of a monotone baseline hazard in the Cox model

Supplementary Material

Hendrik Paul Lopuhaä[†] and Eni Musta[†]

Delft University of Technology[†]

Appendix A. Entropy bounds for the smoothed Grenander-type estimator

Lemma A.1. *Let $0 < x < M < \tau_H$ and let $\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{K}}$ be the class of functions of bounded variation on $[0, M]$, that are uniformly bounded by $\tilde{K} > 0$. Let $\mathcal{G}_n = \{\zeta_{B,n} : B \in \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{K}}\}$, where $\zeta_{B,n}(u, \delta) = \delta \mathbb{1}_{[x-b,x+b]}(u)B(u)$ and $n^{1/5}b \to c > 0$. For $\delta > 0$, let*

$$J(\delta, \mathcal{G}_n) = \sup_Q \int_0^\delta \sqrt{1 + \log N(\epsilon \|F_n\|_{L_2(Q)}, \mathcal{G}_n, L_2(Q))}\, \mathrm{d}\epsilon$$

where $N(\epsilon, \mathcal{G}_n, L_2(Q))$ is the minimal number of $L_2(Q)$-balls of radius ϵ needed to cover $\mathcal{G}_n$, $F_n = \tilde{K}\delta \mathbb{1}_{[x-b,x+b]}$ is the envelope of $\mathcal{G}_n$, and the supremum is taken over measures Q on $[0, M] \times \{0, 1\} \times \mathbb{R}^p$, for which $Q([x - b, x + b] \times \{1\} \times \mathbb{R}^p) > 0$. Then $J(\delta, \mathcal{G}_n) \leq \int_0^\delta \sqrt{1 + C/\epsilon}\, \mathrm{d}\epsilon$, for some $C > 0$.

Proof. We first bound the entropy of $\mathcal{G}_n$ with respect to any probability measure Q on $[0, M] \times \{0, 1\} \times \mathbb{R}^p$, such that

$$\|F_n\|^2_{L_2(Q)} = \tilde{K} Q\left([x - b, x + b] \times \{1\} \times \mathbb{R}^p\right) > 0. \tag{73}$$

Fix such a probability measure Q and let $\epsilon > 0$. Let Q' be the probability measure on $[0, M]$ defined by

$$Q'(S) = \frac{Q(S \cap [x - b, x + b] \times \{1\} \times \mathbb{R}^p)}{Q([x - b, x + b] \times \{1\} \times \mathbb{R}^p)}, \qquad S \in [0, M],$$

For a given $\epsilon' > 0$, select a minimal ϵ'-net $B_1, \ldots, B_N$ in $\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{K}}$ with respect to $L_2(Q')$, where $N = N(\epsilon', \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{K}}, L_2(Q'))$. Then, from (2.6) in [13]

$$\log N(\epsilon', \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{K}}, L_2(Q')) \leq \frac{K}{\epsilon'}, \tag{74}$$

for some constant $K > 0$. Then, consider the functions $\zeta_{B_1,n}, \ldots, \zeta_{B_N,n}$ corresponding to $B_1, \ldots, B_N$. For any $\zeta_{B,n} \in \mathcal{G}_n$, there exists a B_i in the ϵ'-net that is closest function to B, i.e., $\|B - B_i\|_{L_2(Q')} \leq \epsilon'$. Then, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \|\zeta_{B,n} - \zeta_{B_i,n}\|_{L_2(Q)} &= Q([x - b, x + b] \times \{1\} \times \mathbb{R}^p)^{1/2} \| B - B_i\|_{L_2(Q')} \\ &\leq Q([x - b, x + b] \times \{1\} \times \mathbb{R}^p)^{1/2} \epsilon'. \end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

Hence, if we take $\epsilon' = \epsilon/Q([x-b,x+b]\times\{1\}\times\mathbb{R}^p)^{1/2}$, it follows that $\zeta_{B_1,n},\ldots,\zeta_{B_N,n}$ forms an ϵ-net in $\mathcal{G}_n$ with respect to $L_2(Q)$, and $N(\epsilon,\mathcal{G}_n,L_2(Q)) \le N(\epsilon',\mathcal{B}_{\tilde{K}},L_2(Q'))$. Using (74), this implies that

$$\log N(\epsilon,\mathcal{G}_n,L_2(Q)) \le \frac{K}{\epsilon'} = \frac{K\cdot Q([x-b,x+b]\times\{1\}\times\mathbb{R}^p)^{1/2}}{\epsilon}$$

where K does not depend on Q, and according to (73),

$$J(\delta,\mathcal{G}_n) = \sup_Q \int_0^\delta \sqrt{1+\log N(\epsilon\|F_n\|_{L_2(Q)},\mathcal{G}_n,L_2(Q))}\,\mathrm{d}\epsilon \le \int_0^\delta \sqrt{1+\frac{C}{\epsilon\tilde{K}^{1/2}}}\,\mathrm{d}\epsilon,$$

for some $C>0$. □

Lemma A.2. *Let $\mathcal{M}_C$ be the class of monotone functions bounded uniformly by $C>0$. Let $\mathcal{G}_n = \{\zeta_{r,\beta}(u,z) : r\in\mathcal{M}_C, \beta\in\mathbb{R}^P, |\beta-\beta_0|\le\xi_2\}$, where ξ_2 is chosen as in (38) and $\zeta_{r,\beta}(u,z) = r(u)\mathrm{e}^{\beta' z}$. For $\delta>0$, let*

$$J_{[]}(\delta,\mathcal{G}_n,L_2(\mathbb{P})) = \int_0^\delta \sqrt{1+\log N_{[]}(\epsilon\|F_n\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P})},\mathcal{G}_n,L_2(\mathbb{P}))}\,\mathrm{d}\epsilon.$$

where $N_{[]}(\epsilon,\mathcal{G}_n,L_2(\mathbb{P}))$ is the bracketing number and

$$F_n(u,z) = C\exp\left\{\sum_{j=1}^p(\beta_{0,j}-\sigma_n)z_j \vee (\beta_{0,j}+\sigma_n)z_j\right\},$$

with $\sigma_n = \sqrt{\xi_2 n^{-2/3}}$ is the envelope of $\mathcal{G}_n$. Then $J_{[]}(\delta,\mathcal{G}_n,L_2(\mathbb{P})) \le \int_0^\delta\sqrt{1+C/\epsilon}\,\mathrm{d}\epsilon$, for some $C>0$.

Proof. The entropy with bracketing for the class of bounded monotone functions on $\mathbb{R}$ satisfies

$$\log N_{[]}(\gamma,\mathcal{M}_C,L_p(Q)) \le \frac{K}{\gamma}, \tag{76}$$

for every probability measure Q, $\gamma>0$ and $p\ge1$ (e.g., see Theorem 2.7.5 in [34]). Define the probability measure Q on $\mathbb{R}$ by

$$Q(S) = \int \mathbb{1}_S(u)\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{u},\delta,\mathrm{z}), \qquad \text{for all S}\subseteq\mathbb{R},$$

and fix $\epsilon>0$. For a given $\gamma>0$, take a net of γ-brackets $\{(l_1,L_1)\ldots,(l_N,L_N)\}$ in $\mathcal{M}_C$ with respect to $L_4(Q)$, where $N = N_{[]}(\gamma,\mathcal{M}_C,L_4(Q))$. For every $j=1,\ldots,p$, divide the interval $[\beta_{0,j}-\sigma_n,\beta_{0,j}+\sigma_n]$ in subintervals of length γ, i.e.,

$$\left[a_{k_j},b_{k_j}\right] = \left[\beta_{0,j}-\sigma_n+k_j\gamma,\beta_{0,j}-\sigma_n+(k_j+1)\gamma\right],$$

for $k_j = 0, \dots, \bar{N} - 1$, where $\bar{N} = 2\sigma_n/\gamma$. Then, construct brackets $(l_{i,k_1,\dots,k_p}, L_{i,k_1,\dots,k_p})$, for $i = 1, \dots, N$ and $k_j = 0, \dots, \bar{N} - 1$, for $j = 1, \dots, p$, in the following way:

$$l_{i,k_1,\dots,k_p}(u,z) = l_i(u) \exp\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{p} a_{k_j} z_j \wedge b_{k_j} z_j\right\},$$
$$L_{i,k_1,\dots,k_p}(u,z) = L_i(u) \exp\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{p} a_{k_j} z_j \vee b_{k_j} z_j\right\}.$$

By construction, using (76), the number of these brackets is

$$N \cdot \bar{N}^p \leq \exp\{K/\gamma\} \cdot \left(\frac{2\sigma_n}{\gamma}\right)^p \leq \exp\{K/\gamma\} \cdot \exp\left\{2p\sqrt{\xi_2}/\gamma\right\} = \mathrm{e}^{K_1/\gamma}, \tag{77}$$

for some $K_1 > 0$ independent of $n \geq 1$. For any $\zeta_{r,\beta} \in \mathcal{G}_n$, there exist a γ-bracket (l_i, L_i), such that $r \in [l_i, L_i]$, and intervals $[a_{k_j}, b_{k_j}]$, such that $\beta_j \in [a_{k_j}, b_{k_j}]$, for all $j = 1, \dots, p$. It follows that there exists a bracket $(l_{i,k_1,\dots,k_p}, L_{i,k_1,\dots,k_p})$, such that $\zeta_{r,\beta} \in [l_{i,k_1,\dots,k_p}, L_{i,k_1,\dots,k_p}]$. Moreover, for each $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $k_j = 0, \dots, \bar{N} - 1$, for $j = 1, \dots, p$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|l_{i,k_1,\dots,k_p} - L_{i,k_1,\dots,k_p}\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P})} \\
&= \left(\int \left|l_{i,k_1,\dots,k_p}(u,z) - L_{i,k_1,\dots,k_p}(u,z)\right|^2 \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(u,\delta,z)\right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq \left(\int \exp\left\{2\sum_{j=1}^{p} a_{k_j} z_j \wedge b_{k_j} z_j\right\} |l_i(u) - L_i(u)|^2 \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(u,\delta,z)\right)^{1/2} \\
&\quad + C\left(\int \left|\exp\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{p} a_{k_j} z_j \wedge b_{k_j} z_j\right\} - \exp\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{p} a_{k_j} z_j \vee b_{k_j} z_j\right\}\right|^2 \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(u,\delta,z)\right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq \left(\int \exp\left\{4\sum_{j=1}^{p} a_{k_j} z_j \wedge b_{k_j} z_j\right\} \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(u,\delta,z)\right)^{1/4} \left(\int |l_i(u) - L_i(u)|^4 \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(u,\delta,z)\right)^{1/4} \\
&\quad + C\left(\int \left|\exp\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{p} a_{k_j} z_j \wedge b_{k_j} z_j\right\} - \exp\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{p} a_{k_j} z_j \vee b_{k_j} z_j\right\}\right|^2 \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(u,\delta,z)\right)^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the first term on the right hand side, we use that for all $j = 1, \dots, p$,

$$\left|a_{k_j} - \beta_{0,j}\right| \leq \sigma_n \quad \text{and} \quad \left|b_{k_j} - \beta_{0,j}\right| \leq \sigma_n, \tag{78}$$

so that, according to (A3), there exist a $K_1 > 0$, such that for n sufficiently large

$$\int \exp\left\{4\sum_{j=1}^{p} a_{k_j} z_j \wedge b_{k_j} z_j\right\} \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(u,\delta,z) \leq \sup_{|\beta - \beta_0| \leq p\sigma_n} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathrm{e}^{4\beta' Z}\right] \leq K_1.$$

For the second term we have

$$\left(\int |l_i(u) - L_i(u)|^4 \, \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(u, \delta, z) \right)^{1/4} = \|l_i - L_i\|_{L_4(Q)} \leq \gamma,$$

by construction, and by the mean value theorem, the third term on the right hand side can be bounded by

$$C \left(\int \left(\gamma \sum_{i=1}^{p} |z_i| \right)^2 \mathrm{e}^{2\theta_z} \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(u, \delta, z) \right)^{1/2} \leq C' \gamma \left(\int |z|^2 \mathrm{e}^{2\theta_z} \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(u, \delta, z) \right)^{1/2},$$

for some $\sum_{j=1}^{p} a_{k_j} z_j \wedge b_{k_j} z_j \leq \theta_z \leq \sum_{j=1}^{p} a_{k_j} z_j \vee b_{k_j} z_j$. Consequently, in view of (78), we find

$$\|l_{i,k_1,\ldots,k_p} - L_{i,k_1,\ldots,k_p}\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P})} \leq \gamma K_1^{1/4} + C' \gamma \left(\sup_{|\beta - \beta_0| \leq p\sigma_n} \mathbb{E}\left[|Z|^2 \mathrm{e}^{2\beta' Z} \right] \right)^{1/2} \leq K' \gamma,$$

for some $K' > 0$, using (A2). Hence, if we take $\gamma = \epsilon / K'$, then $\{(l_{i,k_1,\ldots,k_p}, L_{i,k_1,\ldots,k_p})\}$, for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ and $k_j = 0, \ldots, \bar{N} - 1$, for $j = 1, \ldots, p$, forms a net of ϵ-brackets, and according to (77), there exists a $K > 0$, such that

$$\log N_{[]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{G}_n, L_2(\mathbb{P})) \leq \frac{K}{\epsilon}.$$

As a result,

$$J_{[]}(1, \mathcal{G}_n, L_2(\mathbb{P})) = \int_0^1 \sqrt{1 + \log N_{[]}(\epsilon \|F\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P})}, \mathcal{G}_n, L_2(\mathbb{P}))} \, \mathrm{d}\epsilon = \int_0^1 \sqrt{1 + \frac{K}{\epsilon}} \, \mathrm{d}\epsilon,$$

for some $K > 0$. □

Appendix B. Smooth maximum likelihood estimator

To derive the pointwise asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\lambda}_n^{SM}$, we follow the same approach as the one used for $\tilde{\lambda}_n^{SG}$. We will go through the same line of reasoning as used to obtain Theorem 3.5. However, large parts of the proof are very similar, if not the same. We briefly sketch the main steps.

Instead of $\tilde{\Lambda}_n$, we use

$$\hat{\Lambda}_n(x) = \int_0^x \hat{\lambda}_n(u) \, \mathrm{d}u,$$

where $\hat{\lambda}_n$ is the MLE for λ_0. First, the analogue of Lemma 3.1 still holds.

Lemma B.1. *Let $a_{n,x}$ be defined by* (13) *and let $\hat{\beta}_n$ be the partial maximum likelihood estimator for β_0. Define*

$$\theta_{n,x}(u, \delta, z) = \mathbb{1}_{E_n} \left\{ \delta a_{n,x}(u) - \mathrm{e}^{\hat{\beta}_n' z} \int_0^u a_{n,x}(v) \, \mathrm{d}\hat{\Lambda}_n(v) \right\}, \tag{79}$$

Then, there exists an event E_n, with $\mathbb{1}_{E_n} \to 1$ in probability, such that

$$\int \theta_{n,x}(u,\delta,z)\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(u,\delta,z) = -\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\int k_b(x-u)\,\mathrm{d}(\hat{\Lambda}_n - \Lambda_0)(u) + O_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

Proof. We modify the definition of the event E_n from Lemma 3.1 as follows. The events $E_{n,1}$, $E_{n,2}$, $E_{n,4}$, and $E_{n,5}$, from (36) and (38) remain the same. Replace $E_{n,3}$ in (38) by

$$E_{n,3} = \left\{ \sup_{x\in[T_{(1)},T_{(n)}]} |V_n(x) - H^{uc}(x)| < \xi_3 \right\}, \tag{80}$$

and let

$$E_{n,6} = \left\{ T_{(1)} \le \epsilon \right\}, \tag{81}$$

for some $\epsilon > 0$ and $\xi_3 > 0$. Then $\mathbb{P}(E_{n,6}) \to 1$, and also $\mathbb{P}(E_{n,3}) \to 1$ according to Lemma 5 in [26]. As before $E_n = \bigcap_{i=1}^6 E_{n,i}$. Similar to the proof of Lemma 3.1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int \theta_{n,x}(u,\delta,z)\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(u,\delta,z)\\
&= \mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left\{ \int a_{n,x}(u)\,\mathrm{d}H^{uc}(u) - \int \mathrm{e}^{\hat{\beta}_n' z}\int_{v=0}^{u} a_{n,x}(v)\,\mathrm{d}\hat{\Lambda}_n(v)\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(u,\delta,z)\right\}\\
&= \mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left\{ -\int k_b(x-u)\,\mathrm{d}(\hat{\Lambda}_n - \Lambda_0)(u) + \int k_b(x-u)\left(1 - \frac{\Phi(u;\hat{\beta}_n)}{\Phi(u;\beta_0)}\right)\mathrm{d}\hat{\Lambda}_n(u)\right\},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\int k_b(x-u)\left|1 - \frac{\Phi(u;\hat{\beta}_n)}{\Phi(u;\beta_0)}\right|\mathrm{d}\hat{\Lambda}_n(u) = O_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

which proves the lemma. □

Next, we slightly change the definition of $\overline{\Psi}_{n,x}$ from (17), i.e.,

$$\overline{\Psi}_{n,x}(u) = \overline{a}_{n,x}(u)\mathbb{1}_{E_n} = a_{n,x}(\hat{A}_n(u))\mathbb{1}_{E_n} \tag{82}$$

where E_n is the event from Lemma B.1 and $\hat{A}_n$, as defined in (16), is now taken constant on $[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1})$ and consider

$$\bar{\theta}_{n,x}(u,\delta,z) = \delta\overline{\Psi}_{n,x}(u) - \mathrm{e}^{\hat{\beta}_n' z}\int_0^u \overline{\Psi}_{n,x}(v)\,\mathrm{d}\hat{\Lambda}_n(v). \tag{83}$$

With this $\bar{\theta}_{n,x}$, we have the same property as in Lemma 3.2.

Lemma B.2. *Let $\bar{\theta}_{n,x}$ be defined in* (83)*. Then*

$$\int \bar{\theta}_{n,x}(u,\delta,z)\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_n(u,\delta,z) = 0.$$

Proof. Similar to the proof of Lemma 3.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int \bar{\theta}_{n,x}(u,\delta,z)\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_n(u,\delta,z)\\
&= \mathbb{1}_{E_n}\sum_{i=0}^{m}\overline{a}_{n,x}(\tau_i)\left\{\int \mathbb{1}_{[\tau_i,\tau_{i+1})}(u)\delta\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_n(u,\delta,z) - \int_{\tau_i}^{\tau_{i+1}}\Phi_n(v;\hat{\beta}_n)\,\mathrm{d}\hat{\Lambda}_n(v)\right\}\\
&= \mathbb{1}_{E_n}\sum_{i=0}^{m}\overline{a}_{n,x}(\tau_i)\left\{V_n(\tau_{i+1}) - V_n(\tau_i) - \hat{\lambda}_n(\tau_i)\left(\hat{W}_n(\tau_{i+1}) - \hat{W}_n(\tau_i)\right)\right\}\\
&= 0,
\end{aligned}$$

The last equality follows from the characterization of the maximum likelihood estimator. □

Furthermore, for $\bar{\theta}_{n,x}$ defined in (83), we also have

$$\int \left\{\bar{\theta}_{n,x}(u,\delta,z) - \theta_{n,x}(u,\delta,z)\right\}\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(u,\delta,z) = O_p(b^{-1}n^{-2/3}), \tag{84}$$

see Lemma B.8, and

$$\int \left\{\bar{\theta}_{n,x}(u,\delta,z) - \eta_{n,x}(u,\delta,z)\right\}\,\mathrm{d}(\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P})(u,\delta,z) = O_p(b^{-3/2}n^{-13/18}) + O_p(n^{-1/2}), \tag{85}$$

see Lemma B.10, where $\eta_{n,x}$ is defined similar to (23), but with E_n taken from Lemma B.1. Similar to the proof of Lemma 3.3, the proof of Lemma B.8 is quite technical and involves bounds on the tail probabilities of the inverse process corresponding to $\hat{\lambda}_n$ (see Lemma B.5), used to obtain the analogue of (22) (see Lemma B.6). It is defined by

$$\hat{U}_n(a) = \operatorname*{argmin}_{x\in[T_{(1)},T_{(n)}]}\left\{V_n(x) - a\hat{W}_n(x)\right\} \tag{86}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{W}_n(x) &= \int\left(\mathrm{e}^{\hat{\beta}_n' z}\int_{T_{(1)}}^{x}\mathbb{1}_{\{u\geq s\}}\,\mathrm{d}s\right)\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_n(u,\delta,z), \quad x\geq T_{(1)},\\
V_n(x) &= \int \delta\mathbb{1}_{\{u<x\}}\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}_n(u,\delta,z),
\end{aligned} \tag{87}$$

with $\hat{\beta}_n$ being the partial maximum likelihood estimator (see Lemma 1 in [26]) and it satisfies the switching relation $\hat{\lambda}_n(x)\leq a$ if and only if $\hat{U}_n(a)\geq x$. Let U be the inverse of λ_0 on $[\lambda_0(\epsilon),\lambda_0(M)]$, for some $0<\epsilon<M<\tau_H$, i.e.,

$$U(a) = \begin{cases}\epsilon & a<\lambda_0(\epsilon);\\ \lambda_0^{-1}(a) & a\in[\lambda_0(\epsilon),\lambda_0(M)];\\ M & a>\lambda_0(M).\end{cases} \tag{88}$$

Similar to the bounding the tail probabilities of $\tilde{U}_n(a)$, in order to bound the tail probabilities of $\hat{U}_n(a)$ we first introduce a suitable martingale that will approximate the process $V_n(t) - a\hat{W}_n(t)$.

Lemma B.3. *Define*

$$\bar{\mathbb{B}}_n(t) = V_n(t) - \int_0^t \Phi_n(s;\beta_0)\lambda_0(s)\,\mathrm{d}s. \tag{89}$$

The process $\{(\bar{\mathbb{B}}_n(t), \mathcal{F}_t^n) : 0 \le t < \tau_H\}$ *is a square integrable martingale with mean zero and predictable variation process*

$$\langle \bar{\mathbb{B}}_n \rangle(t) = \frac{1}{n}\int_0^t \Phi_n(s;\beta_0)\,\mathrm{d}\Lambda_0(s).$$

Proof. Note that

$$\bar{\mathbb{B}}_n(t) = \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{M}_n(t) - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{T_i=t\}}\Delta_i$$

where $\mathbb{M}_n$ is defined in (39). Since H^{uc} is absolutely continuous, $\mathbb{1}_{\{T_i=t\}}\Delta_i = 0$ a.s., which means that $\bar{\mathbb{B}}_n = \mathbb{M}_n$ a.s.. Hence $\bar{\mathbb{B}}_n$ is a mean zero martingale and has the same predictable variation as $n^{-1}\mathbb{M}_n$. □

Lemma B.4. *There exists a constant* $C > 0$ *such that, for all* $x > 0$ *and* $t \in [0, \tau_H]$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{u\in[0,\tau_H],|t-u|\le x}\left(\bar{\mathbb{B}}_n(u) - \bar{\mathbb{B}}_n(t)\right)^2\right] \le \frac{Cx}{n}.$$

Proof. First, consider the case $t \le u \le t + x$. Then, by Doob's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{u\in[0,\tau_H],t\le u\le t+x}(\bar{\mathbb{B}}_n(u) - \bar{\mathbb{B}}_n(t))^2\right] &\le 4\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\bar{\mathbb{B}}_n\big((t+x)\wedge\tau_H\big) - \bar{\mathbb{B}}_n(t)\right)^2\right] \\
&= 4\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\bar{\mathbb{B}}_n\big((t+x)\wedge\tau_H\big)\right)^2 - \left(\bar{\mathbb{B}}_n(t)\right)^2\right] \\
&= \frac{4}{n}\mathbb{E}\left[\int_t^{(t+x)\wedge\tau_H}\Phi_n(s;\beta_0)\lambda_0(s)\,\mathrm{d}s\right] \\
&\le \frac{4\lambda_0(\tau_H)x}{n}\mathbb{E}\left[\Phi_n(0;\beta_0)\right] \\
&= \frac{4\lambda_0(\tau_H)x}{n}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\beta_0' Z_i}\right] \le \frac{Kx}{n}
\end{aligned}$$

for some $K > 0$, using (A2). For the case $t - x \leq u \leq t$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{u\in[0,\tau_H],t-x\leq u\leq t}\left(\bar{\mathbb{B}}_n(u)-\bar{\mathbb{B}}_n(t)\right)^2\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{0\vee(t-x)\leq u\leq t}\left(\bar{\mathbb{B}}_n(u)-\bar{\mathbb{B}}_n(t)\right)^2\right]\\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\bar{\mathbb{B}}_n(t)-\bar{\mathbb{B}}_n(0\vee(t-x))\right)^2\right]+2\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{0\vee(t-x)\leq u<t}\left(\bar{\mathbb{B}}_n(u)-\bar{\mathbb{B}}_n(0\vee(t-x))\right)^2\right].\end{aligned}$$

Then similar, the right hand side is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}&2\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\bar{\mathbb{B}}_n(t)-\bar{\mathbb{B}}_n(0\vee(t-x))\right)^2\right]+8\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\bar{\mathbb{B}}_n(t)-\bar{\mathbb{B}}_n(0\vee(t-x))\right)^2\right]\\ &=10\mathbb{E}\left[\bar{\mathbb{B}}_n(t)^2-\bar{\mathbb{B}}_n(0\vee(t-x))^2\right]=\frac{10}{n}\mathbb{E}\left[\int_{0\vee(t-x)}^{t}\Phi_n(s;\beta_0)\lambda_0(s)\,\mathrm{d}s\right]\\ &\leq\frac{10\lambda_0(\tau_H)x}{n}\mathbb{E}\left[\Phi_n(0;\beta_0)\right]\leq\frac{Cx}{n},\end{aligned}$$

for some $C > 0$. This concludes the proof. □

Lemma B.5. *Let $0 < \epsilon < M < \tau_H$ and let $\hat{U}_n(a)$ and U be defined in (86) and (88). Suppose that λ_0' is uniformly bounded below by a strictly positive constant. Then, there exists an event E_n, such that $\mathbb{1}_{E_n} \to 1$ in probability, and a constant K such that, for every $a \geq 0$ and $x > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{|\hat{U}_n(a)-U(a)|\geq x\right\}\cap E_n\cap\left\{\epsilon\leq\hat{U}_n(a)\leq M\right\}\right)\leq\frac{K}{nx^3}. \tag{90}$$

Proof. Similar to the proof of Lemma 5.3, we start by writing

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{|\hat{U}_n(a)-U(a)|\geq x\right\}\cap E_n\cap\left\{\epsilon\leq\hat{U}_n(a)\leq M\right\}\right)\\ &=\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{U(a)+x\leq\hat{U}_n(a)\leq M\right\}\cap E_n\right)+\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\epsilon\leq\hat{U}_n(a)\leq U(a)-x\right\}\cap E_n\right).\end{aligned} \tag{91}$$

The first probability is zero if $U(a) + x > M$. Otherwise, if $U(a) + x \leq M$, then $x \leq M$ and we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{U(a)+x\leq\hat{U}_n(a)\leq M\right\}\cap E_n\right)\\ &\leq\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\inf_{y\in[U(a)+x,M]}\left(V_n(y)-a\hat{W}_n(y)-V_n(U(a))+a\hat{W}_n(U(a))\right)\leq 0\right\}\cap E_n\right).\end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\bar{R}_n(t)=a\int_0^t\left(\Phi_n(s;\beta_0)-\Phi_n(s;\hat{\beta}_n)\right)\,\mathrm{d}s. \tag{92}$$

Then, for $T_{(1)} < U(a) < y$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\bar{\mathbb{B}}_n(y) - \bar{\mathbb{B}}_n(U(a)) + \bar{R}_n(y) - \bar{R}_n(U(a)) \\
&= V_n(y) - V_n(U(a)) - \int_{U(a)}^{y} \Phi_n(s;\beta_0)\lambda_0(s)\,\mathrm{d}s + a\int_{U(a)}^{y} \left(\Phi_n(s;\beta_0) - \Phi_n(s;\hat{\beta}_n)\right)\,\mathrm{d}s \\
&= V_n(y) - V_n(U(a)) - a\int_{U(a)}^{y} \Phi_n(s;\hat{\beta}_n)\,\mathrm{d}s - \int_{U(a)}^{y} \Phi_n(s;\beta_0)\lambda_0(s)\,\mathrm{d}s + a\int_{U(a)}^{y} \Phi_n(s;\beta_0)\,\mathrm{d}s \\
&= V_n(y) - a\hat{W}_n(y) - V_n(U(a)) + a\hat{W}_n(U(a)) - \int_{U(a)}^{y} \Phi_n(s;\beta_0)(\lambda_0(s) - a)\,\mathrm{d}s.
\end{aligned}$$

On the event E_n, by Taylor expansion we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{U(a)}^{y} \Phi_n(s;\beta_0)(\lambda_0(s) - a)\,\mathrm{d}s &= \int_{U(a)}^{y} \Phi_n(s;\beta_0)(\lambda_0(s) - \lambda_0(U(a)))\,\mathrm{d}s \\
&= \int_{U(a)}^{y} \Phi_n(s;\beta_0)\left(\lambda_0'(\xi_s)(s - U(a))\right)\,\mathrm{d}s \\
&\geq \inf_{t\in[0,\tau_H)} \lambda_0'(t)\left(\Phi(M;\beta_0) - \xi_4 n^{-1/3}\right)\frac{1}{2}(y - U(a))^2 \\
&\geq c(y - U(a))^2
\end{aligned}$$

for some $c > 0$. Similar to the proof of Lemma 5.3, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\inf_{y\in[U(a)+x,M]}\left(V_n(y) - a\hat{W}_n(y) - V_n(U(a)) + a\hat{W}_n(U(a))\right) \leq 0\right\} \cap E_n\right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\inf_{y\in[U(a)+x,M]}\left(\bar{\mathbb{B}}_n(y) - \bar{\mathbb{B}}_n(U(a)) + \bar{R}_n(y) - \bar{R}_n(U(a)) + c(y - U(a))^2\right) \leq 0\right\} \cap E_n\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, as before

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{U(a) + x \leq \hat{U}_n(a) \leq M\right\} \cap E_n\right) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^{i} \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\sup_{I_k}\left(\left|\bar{\mathbb{B}}_n(y) - \bar{\mathbb{B}}_n(U(a))\right| + \left|\bar{R}_n(y) - \bar{R}_n(U(a))\right|\right) \geq cx^2 2^{2k}\right\} \cap E_n\right)
\end{aligned}$$

where the supremum runs over $y \leq M$, such that $y - U(a) \in [x2^k, x2^{k+1})$. With Markov, we can bound this probability by

$$\begin{aligned}
&4\sum_{k=0}^{i}\left(c^2x^4 2^{4k}\right)^{-1}\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{y\leq M, y-U(a)\in[x2^k,x2^{k+1})}\left|\bar{\mathbb{B}}_n(y) - \bar{\mathbb{B}}_n(U(a))\right|^2\right] \\
&\quad + 8\sum_{k=0}^{i}\left(c^3x^6 2^{6k}\right)^{-1}\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{y<M, y-U(a)\in[x2^k,x2^{k+1})}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left|\bar{R}_n(y) - \bar{R}_n(U(a))\right|^3\right].
\end{aligned} \tag{93}$$

As in the proof of Lemma 5.3, we will bound both expectations separately. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{y<M,\, y-U(a)\in[x2^k,x2^{k+1})} \mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left|\bar{R}_n(y)-\bar{R}_n(U(a))\right|^3\right]\\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left(\int_{U(a)}^{(U(a)+x2^{k+1})\wedge M} a\left|\Phi_n(s;\beta_0)-\Phi_n(s;\hat{\beta}_n)\right|\,\mathrm{d}s\right)^3\right]\\
&\leq x^3 2^{3(k+1)}\lambda_0(M)^3\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\sup_{s\in[0,M]}\left|\Phi_n(s;\beta_0)-\Phi_n(s;\hat{\beta}_n)\right|^3\right]\\
&\leq x^3 2^{3(k+1)}\lambda_0(M)^3\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{1}_{E_n}|\hat{\beta}_n-\beta_0|^3\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}\left|D_n^{(1)}(\beta^*;x)\right|^3\right]\\
&\leq x^3 2^{3(k+1)}\lambda_0(M)^3\frac{L^3\xi_2^{3/2}}{n}\leq\frac{Cx^3 2^{3(k+1)}}{n},
\end{aligned}$$

for some $C>0$.

To bound the first expectation in (93), we use Lemma B.4 and we can argue as in the proof of Lemma 5.3 to obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{U(a)+x\leq\hat{U}_n(a)\leq M\right\}\cap E_n\right)\leq\frac{K}{nx^3}.$$

We can deal in the same way as in the proof of Lemma 5.3 with the second probability on the right hand side of (91), using the properties of $\bar{\mathbb{B}}_n$ and $\bar{R}_n$. □

Note that on the event E_n from Lemma B.1, similar to (50), we have

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}|\Phi_n(x;\hat{\beta}_n)-\Phi(x;\beta_0)|\leq\frac{C_\phi}{n^{1/3}},\tag{94}$$

where $C_\phi=\sqrt{\xi_2}L+\xi_4$, with L the upper bound from (37).

Lemma B.6. *Take $0<\epsilon<\epsilon'<M'<M<\tau_H$. Let $\hat{\lambda}_n$ be the maximum likelihood estimator of a nondecreasing baseline hazard rate λ_0, which is differentiable with λ_0' uniformly bounded above and below by strictly positive constants. Let E_n be the event from Lemma B.1. Take $\xi_2>0$ and $\xi_4>0$ in (38) sufficiently small, such that*

$$C_\phi<\frac{\Phi(M;\beta_0)}{2\lambda_0(M)}\min\{\epsilon'-\epsilon,M-M'\}\inf_{x\in[0,\tau_H]}\lambda_0'(x).\tag{95}$$

and take ξ_3 in (80) sufficiently small, such that

$$\xi_3\leq\frac{1}{4}\left\{\frac{(M-M')}{2}\inf_{x\in[0,\tau_H]}\lambda_0'(x)-\frac{C_\phi}{\Phi(M;\beta_0)}\lambda_0(M)\right\}(M-M')\Phi(M;\beta_0).\tag{96}$$

Then, there exists a constant C such that, for each $n\in\mathbb{N}$,

$$\sup_{t\in[\epsilon',M']}\mathbb{E}\left[n^{2/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\big(\lambda_0(t)-\hat{\lambda}_n(t)\big)^2\right]\leq C.$$

Proof. It is sufficient to prove that there exist some constants C_1, C_2 such that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and each $t \in [\epsilon', M']$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[n^{2/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left\{(\hat{\lambda}_n(t) - \lambda_0(t))_+\right\}^2\right] \leq C_1, \tag{97}$$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[n^{2/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left\{(\lambda_0(t) - \hat{\lambda}_n(t))_+\right\}^2\right] \leq C_2. \tag{98}$$

Lets first consider (97). Then completely similar to the proof of Lemma 5.4 we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[n^{2/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left\{(\hat{\lambda}_n(t) - \lambda_0(t))_+\right\}^2\right] \leq 4\eta^2 + 4\int_\eta^\infty \mathbb{P}\left(n^{1/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}(\hat{\lambda}_n(t) - \lambda_0(t)) > x\right) x\,\mathrm{d}x,$$

for a fixed $\eta > 0$, where

$$\mathbb{P}\left(n^{1/3}\,\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\,(\hat{\lambda}_n(t) - \lambda_0(t)) > x\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\{\hat{U}_n(a + n^{-1/3}x) < t\} \cap E_n\right).$$

We distinguish between the cases

$$a + n^{-1/3}x \leq \lambda_0(M) \quad \text{and} \quad a + n^{-1/3}x > \lambda_0(M),$$

where $a = \lambda_0(t)$. We prove that, in the first case, there exist a positive constant C such that for all $t \in (\epsilon, M']$, and $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbb{P}\{n^{1/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}(\hat{\lambda}_n(t) - \lambda_0(t)) > x\} \leq \frac{C}{x^3},$$

for all $x \geq \eta$, and in the second case $\mathbb{P}\left(n^{1/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}(\hat{\lambda}_n(t) - \lambda_0(t)) > x\right) = 0$. Then (97) follows immediately.

First assume $a + n^{-1/3}x > \lambda_0(M)$. Note that, if $\hat{\lambda}_n(t) > a + n^{-1/3}x$, then for each $y > t$, we have

$$V_n(y) - V_n(t) \geq \hat{\lambda}_n(t)\left(\hat{W}_n(y) - \hat{W}_n(t)\right) > \left(a + n^{-1/3}x\right)\left(\hat{W}_n(y) - \hat{W}_n(t)\right).$$

In particular for $y = \tilde{M} = M' + (M - M')/2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(n^{1/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}(\hat{\lambda}_n(t) - \lambda_0(t)) > x\right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\Big(\Big\{V_n(\tilde{M}) - V_n(t) - \left(H^{uc}(\tilde{M}) - H^{uc}(t)\right) \\
&\qquad > \left(a + n^{-1/3}x\right)\left(\hat{W}_n(\tilde{M}) - \hat{W}_n(t)\right) - \left(H^{uc}(\tilde{M}) - H^{uc}(t)\right)\Big\} \cap E_n\Big) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\Bigg(\Bigg\{2\sup_{x\in[T_{(1)},T_{(n)}]}|V_n(x) - H^{uc}(x)| \\
&\qquad > \int_t^{\tilde{M}}\left\{\left(a + n^{-1/3}x\right)\Phi_n(s;\hat{\beta}_n) - \lambda_0(s)\Phi(s;\beta_0)\right\}\,\mathrm{d}s\Bigg\} \cap E_n\Bigg).
\end{aligned} \tag{99}$$

Note that according to (94), $\Phi_n(s;\hat{\beta}_n) - \Phi(s,\beta_0) \geq -C_\phi$, and that $a + n^{-1/3}x > \lambda_0(M) > \lambda_0(\tilde{M}) \geq \lambda_0(s)$. Therefore, since $C_\phi \leq \Phi(M;\beta_0)$, from (96), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_t^{\tilde{M}} \left\{ \left(a + n^{-1/3}x\right) \Phi_n(s;\hat{\beta}_n) - \lambda_0(s)\Phi(s;\beta_0) \right\} \mathrm{d}s \\
&\geq \Phi(M;\beta_0) \int_t^{\tilde{M}} \left\{ \left(a + n^{-1/3}x\right) \left(1 - \frac{C_\phi}{\Phi(M;\beta_0)}\right) - \lambda_0(s) \right\} \mathrm{d}s \\
&> \Phi(M;\beta_0)(\tilde{M} - M') \left(\lambda_0(M) \left(1 - \frac{C_\phi}{\Phi(M;\beta_0)}\right) - \lambda_0(\tilde{M}) \right) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{M - M'}{2} \inf_{x\in[0,\tau_H]} \lambda_0'(x) - \frac{C_\phi}{\Phi(M;\beta_0)} \lambda_0(M) \right\} (M - M')\Phi(M;\beta_0) \geq 2\xi_3.
\end{aligned} \tag{100}$$

Hence, similar to (59) and (60), we conclude that the probability on the right hand side of (99) is zero.

Then, consider the case $a + n^{-1/3}x \leq \lambda_0(M)$. Similar to (57), from Lemma B.5, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{ \epsilon \leq \hat{U}_n(a + n^{-1/3}x) < t \right\} \cap E_n \right) \leq \frac{C}{x^3}$$

for some $C > 0$. Moreover, for the case $\hat{U}_n(a + n^{-1/3}x) < \epsilon$, we find

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{ \hat{U}_n(a + n^{-1/3}x) < \epsilon \right\} \cap E_n \right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{ \hat{\lambda}_n(\epsilon) > a + n^{-1/3}x \right\} \cap E_n \right).$$

Note that, if $\hat{\lambda}_n(\epsilon) > a + n^{-1/3}x$, then for each $y > \epsilon$, we have

$$V_n(y) - V_n(\epsilon) \geq \hat{\lambda}_n(\epsilon) \left(\hat{W}_n(y) - \hat{W}_n(\epsilon) \right) > \left(a + n^{-1/3}x\right) \left(\hat{W}_n(y) - \hat{W}_n(\epsilon) \right).$$

In particular for $y = \tilde{\epsilon} = \epsilon + (\epsilon' - \epsilon)/2$, similar to (99), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{ \hat{\lambda}_n(\epsilon) > a + n^{-1/3}x \right\} \cap E_n \right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{ V_n(\tilde{\epsilon}) - V_n(\epsilon) > \left(a + n^{-1/3}x\right) \left(\hat{W}_n(y) - \hat{W}_n(\epsilon) \right) \right\} \cap E_n \right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\Bigg(\Bigg\{ 2 \sup_{x\in[T_{(1)},T_{(n)}]} |V_n(x) - H^{uc}(x)| \\
&\qquad > \int_\epsilon^{\tilde{\epsilon}} \left\{ \left(a + n^{-1/3}x\right) \Phi_n(s;\hat{\beta}_n) - \lambda_0(s)\Phi(s;\beta_0) \right\} \mathrm{d}s \Bigg\} \cap E_n \Bigg).
\end{aligned} \tag{101}$$

Then, similar to (100) and using $\tilde{\epsilon} > \epsilon'$, from (96) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_\epsilon^{\tilde{\epsilon}} \left\{ \left(a + n^{-1/3}x\right) \Phi_n(s;\hat{\beta}_n) - \lambda_0(s)\Phi(s;\beta_0) \right\} \mathrm{d}s \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{\epsilon' - \epsilon}{2} \inf_{x\in[0,\tau_H]} \lambda_0'(x) - \frac{C_\phi}{\Phi(M,\beta_0)} \lambda_0(\epsilon') \right\} (\epsilon' - \epsilon)\, \Phi(M;\beta_0) \geq 2\xi_3,
\end{aligned}$$

and we conclude that the probability on the right hand side of (101) is zero. This concludes the proof of (97).

We proceed with (98). Arguing as in the proof of (97), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\left[n^{2/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left\{(\lambda_0(t)-\hat{\lambda}_n(t))_+\right\}^2\right] \le \eta^2 + 2\int_\eta^\infty \mathbb{P}\left(n^{1/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left(\lambda_0(t)-\hat{\lambda}_n(t)\right)\ge x\right) x\,\mathrm{d}x,$$

for a fixed $\eta > 0$, where

$$\mathbb{P}\left(n^{1/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left(\lambda_0(t)-\hat{\lambda}_n(t)\right)\ge x\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\hat{U}_n(a-n^{-1/3}x)\ge t\right\}\cap E_n\right),$$

where $a=\lambda_0(t)$. First consider the case $0 < a - n^{-1/3}x \le \lambda_0(\epsilon)$. For each $y < t$, we have

$$V_n(t)-V_n(y) \le \hat{\lambda}_n(t)\left(\hat{W}_n(t)-\hat{W}_n(y)\right) \le \left(a-n^{-1/3}x\right)\left(\hat{W}_n(t)-\hat{W}_n(y)\right).$$

In particular, for $y=\tilde{\epsilon}=\epsilon+(\epsilon'-\epsilon)/2$, similar to (101), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(n^{1/3}\mathbb{1}_{E_n}\left(\lambda_0(t)-\hat{\lambda}_n(t)\right)\ge x\right)\\
&\le \mathbb{P}\Bigg(\Bigg\{2\sup_{x\in[T_{(1)},T_{(n)}]}|V_n(x)-H^{uc}(x)|\\
&\qquad\ge \int_{\tilde{\epsilon}}^t\left\{\left(-a+n^{-1/3}x\right)\Phi_n(s;\hat{\beta}_n)+\lambda_0(s)\Phi(s;\beta_0)\right\}\mathrm{d}s\Bigg\}\cap E_n\Bigg).
\end{aligned} \tag{102}$$

As before, using that $-a+n^{-1/3}x+\lambda_0(s)>0$ and $t-\tilde{\epsilon}\ge\epsilon'-\tilde{\epsilon}=\frac{1}{2}(\epsilon'-\epsilon)$, similar to (100), from (96) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\tilde{\epsilon}}^t\left\{\left(-a+n^{-1/3}x\right)\Phi_n(s;\hat{\beta}_n)+\lambda_0(s)\Phi(s;\beta_0)\right\}\mathrm{d}s\\
&\ge\frac{1}{2}\left\{\frac{\epsilon'-\epsilon}{2}\inf_{x\in[0,\tau_H]}\lambda_0'(x)-\frac{C_\phi}{\Phi(M;\beta_0)}\lambda_0(\epsilon)\right\}(\epsilon'-\epsilon)\Phi(M;\beta_0)\ge 2\xi_3.
\end{aligned} \tag{103}$$

and we conclude that the probability on the right hand side of (102) is zero.

Next, suppose that $a-n^{-1/3}x>\lambda_0(\epsilon)$ and consider

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\hat{U}_n(a-n^{-1/3}x)\ge t\right\}\cap E_n\right).$$

In order to use Lemma B.5, we must intersect with the event $\{\epsilon\le\hat{U}_n(a-n^{-1/3}x)\le M\}$. Note that since $t\in[\epsilon',M']$, we have that $\hat{U}_n(a-n^{-1/3}x)\ge t$ implies $\hat{U}_n(a-n^{-1/3}x)\ge\epsilon$.

Using Lemma B.5 and the mean value theorem, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{t \le \hat{U}_n(a-n^{-1/3}x) \le M\right\} \cap E_n\right) \\
&= \mathbb{P}\Bigg(\left\{\hat{U}_n(a-n^{-1/3}x) - U(a-n^{-1/3}x) \ge t - U(a-n^{-1/3}x)\right\} \\
&\qquad\qquad \cap \left\{\epsilon \le \hat{U}_n(a-n^{-1/3}x) \le M\right\} \cap E_n\Bigg) \\
&\le \mathbb{P}\Bigg(\left\{|\hat{U}_n(a-n^{-1/3}x) - U(a-n^{-1/3}x)| \ge t - U(a-n^{-1/3}x)\right\} \\
&\qquad\qquad \cap \left\{\epsilon \le \hat{U}_n(a-n^{-1/3}x) \le M\right\} \cap E_n\Bigg) \\
&\le \frac{K}{n\left\{t-U(a-n^{-1/3}x)\right\}^3} \le \frac{K}{(U'(\xi_n))^3 x^3} \le \frac{C}{x^3}
\end{aligned}$$

where we use that $t = U(a)$, $\xi_n \in (a-n^{-1/3}x, a)$, and $U'(\xi_n) = 1/\lambda_0'(\lambda_0^{-1}(\xi_n))$ is bounded. Finally, note that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\hat{U}_n(a-n^{-1/3}x) > M\right\} \cap E_n\right) \le \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\hat{\lambda}_n(M) \le a - n^{-1/3}x\right\} \cap E_n\right).$$

If $\hat{\lambda}_n(M) \le a - n^{-1/3}x$, then for each $y < M$, we have

$$V_n(M) - V_n(y) \le \hat{\lambda}_n(M)\left(\hat{W}_n(M) - \hat{W}_n(y)\right) \le \left(a - n^{-1/3}x\right)\left(\hat{W}_n(M) - \hat{W}_n(y)\right).$$

In particular for $y = \tilde{M} = M' + (M-M')/2$, similar to (102), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\hat{\lambda}_n(M) \le a - n^{-1/3}x\right\} \cap E_n\right) \\
&\le \mathbb{P}\Bigg(\Bigg\{2 \sup_{x\in[T_{(1)},T_{(n)}]} |V_n(x) - H^{uc}(x)| \\
&\qquad \ge \int_{\tilde{M}}^{M} \left\{\left(a-n^{-1/3}x\right)\Phi_n(s;\hat{\beta}_n) - \lambda_0(s)\Phi(s;\beta_0)\right\} \mathrm{d}s\Bigg\} \cap E_n\Bigg)
\end{aligned} \tag{104}$$

As before, similar to (103), from (96) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\tilde{M}}^{M} \left\{\left(a-n^{-1/3}x\right)\Phi_n(s;\hat{\beta}_n) - \lambda_0(s)\Phi(s;\beta_0)\right\} \mathrm{d}s \\
&\ge \frac{1}{2}\left\{\frac{M-M'}{2} \inf_{x\in[0,\tau_H]} \lambda_0'(x) - \frac{C_\phi}{\Phi(M;\beta_0)}\lambda_0(M')\right\}(M-M')\Phi(M;\beta_0) \ge 2\xi_3.
\end{aligned}$$

and we conclude that the probability on the right hand side of (104) is zero. This finishes the proof. □

Lemma B.7. *Fix $x \in (0, \tau_h)$ and take $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon' < M' < M < \tau_H$. Let $\hat{\lambda}_n$ be the maximum likelihood estimator of a nondecreasing baseline hazard rate λ_0 which is differentiable with λ_0' uniformly bounded above and below by strictly positive constants. Let E_n be the event from Lemma B.1 and choose C_ϕ and ξ_3 such that they satisfy* (95) *and* (96)*, respectively. Then*

$$\mathbb{1}_{E_n} \int_{x-b}^{x+b} (\lambda_0(t) - \hat{\lambda}_n(t))^2 \, \mathrm{d}t = O_p(bn^{-2/3}).$$

Proof. The proof is exactly the same as the proof of Lemma 5.5 (replacing $\tilde{\lambda}_n$ with $\hat{\lambda}_n$). □

We are now in the position to establish the analogue (84) of Lemma 3.3.

Lemma B.8. *Fix $x \in (0, \tau_h)$ and let $\theta_{n,x}$ and $\bar{\theta}_{n,x}$ be defined by* (79) *and* (83)*, respectively. Assume that λ_0 is differentiable, such that λ_0' is uniformly bounded above and below by strictly positive constants. Let k have support $[-1, 1]$, and suppose it is differentiable with a uniformly bounded derivative. Then, it holds*

$$\int \left\{ \bar{\theta}_{n,x}(u, \delta, z) - \theta_{n,x}(u, \delta, z) \right\} \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(u, \delta, z) = O_p(b^{-1}n^{-2/3}).$$

Proof. Take $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon' < x < M' < M < \tau_H$ and consider n sufficiently large such that $[x - b, x + b] \subset [\epsilon', M']$. Similar to (61), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int \left\{ \bar{\theta}_{n,x}(u, \delta, z) - \theta_{n,x}(u, \delta, z) \right\} \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(u, \delta) \\
&= \mathbb{1}_{E_n} \int_{x-b}^{x+b} \Big(a_{n,x}(\hat{A}_n(u)) - a_{n,x}(u) \Big) \Big(\Phi(u; \beta_0)\lambda_0(u) - \Phi(u; \hat{\beta}_n)\hat{\lambda}_n(u) \Big) \, \mathrm{d}u
\end{aligned}$$

so that by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \int \left\{ \bar{\theta}_{n,x}(u, \delta, z) - \theta_{n,x}(u, \delta, z) \right\} \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(u, \delta, z) \right| \\
&\leq \mathbb{1}_{E_n} \left\| \Big(a_{n,x} \circ \hat{A}_n - a_{n,x} \Big) \mathbb{1}_{[x-b, x+b]} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}_2} \left\| \Big(\Phi_0 \lambda_0 - \hat{\Phi}_n \hat{\lambda}_n \Big) \mathbb{1}_{[x-b, x+b]} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}_2},
\end{aligned} \tag{105}$$

where $\Phi_0(u) = \Phi(u; \beta_0)$ and $\hat{\Phi}_n(u) = \Phi_n(u; \hat{\beta}_n)$. Similar to (63),

$$\mathbb{1}_{E_n} \left\| (a_{n,x}(\hat{A}_n) - a_{n,x}) \mathbb{1}_{[x-b, x+b]} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}_2}^2 \leq \frac{c}{b^4} \mathbb{1}_{E_n} \int_{x-b}^{x+b} (\hat{A}_n(u) - u)^2 \, \mathrm{d}u,$$

for some constant c, and by the same reasoning as in (64), for $u \in [\tau_i, \tau_{i+1})$ and $\hat{A}_n(u) < \tau_{i+1}$, we obtain

$$|u - \hat{A}_n(u)| \leq 2K |\lambda_0(u) - \hat{\lambda}_n(u)|,$$

which also holds in the case $\hat{A}_n(u) = \tau_{i+1}$ simply because $|\lambda_0(u) - \lambda_0(\hat{A}_n(u))| \leq |\lambda_0(u) - \hat{\lambda}_n(u)|$. As a result, using Lemma B.7, we derive that

$$\mathbb{1}_{E_n} \frac{1}{b^4} \int_{x-b}^{x+b} \Big(\hat{A}_n(u) - u \Big)^2 \, \mathrm{d}u \leq \frac{C}{b^4} \mathbb{1}_{E_n} \int_{x-b}^{x+b} \Big(\lambda_0(u) - \hat{\lambda}_n(u) \Big)^2 \, \mathrm{d}u = O_p(b^{-3}n^{-2/3}).$$

The argument for second factor in (105) is the same as for (66), and yields

$$\mathbb{1}_{E_n} \left\| \left(\Phi_0 \lambda_0 - \widehat{\Phi} \tilde{\lambda}_n \right) \mathbb{1}_{[x-b,x+b]} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}_2} = O_p(b^{1/2} n^{-1/3}).$$

Together with (105), this concludes the proof. □

To establish the analogue of Lemma 3.4 for $\hat{\lambda}_n$, similar to Lemma 5.6, we need a stronger version of Lemma B.6. As before, we loose a factor $n^{2/9}$ with respect to the bound in Lemma B.6, which might not be optimal, but suffices for our purposes.

Lemma B.9. *Take $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon' < M' < M < \tau_H$. Let $\hat{\lambda}_n$ be the maximum likelihood estimator of a nondecreasing baseline hazard rate λ_0, which is differentiable with λ_0' uniformly bounded above and below by strictly positive constants. Let E_n be the event from Lemma B.1 and choose C_ϕ and ξ_3 such that they satisfy (95) and (96), respectively. Then, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[n^{4/9} \mathbb{1}_{E_n} \sup_{t \in [\epsilon', M']} \left(\lambda_0(t) - \hat{\lambda}_n(t) \right)^2 \right] \leq C. \tag{106}$$

Proof. The proof is exactly the same as the proof of Lemma 5.6 (replacing $\tilde{\lambda}_n$ with $\hat{\lambda}_n$). □

Lemma B.10. *Fix $x \in (0, \tau_h)$ and take $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon' < x < M' < M < \tau_H$. Assume that λ_0 is differentiable, and such that λ_0' is uniformly bounded above and below by strictly positive constants. Assume that $x \mapsto \Phi(x; \beta_0)$ is differentiable with a bounded derivative in a neighborhood of x. Let $\bar{\theta}_{n,x}$ be defined in (83) and let $\eta_{n,x}$ be defined by (23), where E_n is the event from Lemma B.1. Let k have support $[-1, 1]$, and suppose it is differentiable with a uniformly bounded derivative. Then, it holds*

$$\int \left\{ \bar{\theta}_{n,x}(u, \delta, z) - \eta_{n,x}(u, \delta, z) \right\} \mathrm{d}(\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P})(u, \delta, z) = O_p(b^{-3/2} n^{-13/18}) + O_p(n^{-1/2}). \tag{107}$$

Proof. Let n be sufficiently large, such that $\epsilon' < x - b < x + b < M'$. Denote by R_n the left hand side of (107) and write $R_n = R_{n1} + R_{n2}$, where

$$R_{n1} = n^{-1/2} \mathbb{1}_{E_n} \mathbb{1}_{[x-b,x+b]}(u) \int \delta \left\{ \bar{a}_{n,x}(u) - a_{n,x}(u) \right\} \mathrm{d}\sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P})(u, \delta, z),$$

$$R_{n2} = n^{-1/2} \mathbb{1}_{E_n} \int \mathbb{1}_{\{u > x-b\}} \Bigg\{ \mathrm{e}^{\hat{\beta}_n' z} \int_{x-b}^{u \wedge (x+b)} \bar{a}_{n,x} n(u) \, \mathrm{d}\hat{\Lambda}_n(v) - \mathrm{e}^{\beta_0' z} \int_{x-b}^{u \wedge (x+b)} a_{n,x}(v) \, \mathrm{d}\Lambda_0(v) \Bigg\} \mathrm{d}\sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P})(u, \delta, z).$$

Choose $\eta > 0$. Consider similar two events as in (69):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{n1} &= \left\{ \hat{\lambda}_n(M) > K_1 \right\}, \\ \mathcal{A}_{n2} &= \left\{ \sup_{t \in [\epsilon', M']} \left| \lambda_0(t) - \hat{\lambda}_n(t) \right| > K_2 n^{-2/9} \right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{108}$$

where $K_1, K_2 > 0$, and let $\mathcal{A}_n = \mathcal{A}_{n1} \cup \mathcal{A}_{n2}$. From Lemma B.9 and the fact that $\hat{\lambda}_n(M) = O_p(1)$, it follows that we can choose $K_1, K_2 > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_n) \leq 2\eta/3$. As in the proof of Lemma 3.4, it suffices to show that there exists $\nu > 0$, such that $b^{3/2} n^{13/18} \nu^{-1} \mathbb{E}\big[|R_{n1}| \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_n^c}\big] \leq \eta/3$ and $n^{1/2} \nu^{-1} \mathbb{E}\big[|R_{n2}| \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_n^c}\big] \leq \eta/3$, for all n sufficiently large.

Let us first consider R_{n1}. We have

$$\begin{aligned} a_{n,x}(\hat{A}_n(u)) - a_{n,x}(u) = \frac{k_b(x - \hat{A}_n(u)) - k_b(x-u)}{\Phi(\hat{A}_n(u); \beta_0)} \\ + k_b(x-u) \frac{\Phi(u;\beta_0) - \Phi(\hat{A}_n(u);\beta_0)}{\Phi(\hat{A}_n(u);\beta_0)\Phi(u;\beta_0)}. \end{aligned} \tag{109}$$

Similar to (71),

$$\Big| k_b(x - \hat{A}_n(u)) - k_b(x-u) \Big| \leq b^{-2} n^{-2/9} K_2 \sup_{x \in [-1,1]} |k'(x)|,$$

for some $K_2 > 0$, and similarly, using that $x \mapsto \Phi(x; \beta_0)$ is differentiable with bounded derivative in a neighborhood of x,

$$b^{-1} |\Phi(u;\beta_0) - \Phi(\hat{A}_n(u);\beta_0)| \leq K b^{-1} \, |\hat{A}_n(u) - u| \leq b^{-1} n^{-2/9} K K_3,$$

Consequently, R_{n1} can be written as

$$R_{n1} = \mathbb{1}_{E_n} b^{-2} n^{-13/18} \int \mathbb{1}_{[x-b, x+b]}(u) \delta W_n(u) \, d\sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P})(u, \delta, z),$$

where W_n is a function of bounded variation, uniformly bounded. Completely similar to the proof of Lemma 3.4, together with Lemma A.1 we find that

$$b^2 n^{13/18} \nu^{-1} \mathbb{E}\left[|R_{n1}| \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_n^c}\right] \leq \frac{K''}{\nu n^{2/90}} \leq \eta/3,$$

for sufficiently large ν. For R_{n2} we write

$$n^{1/2} R_{n2} = \mathbb{1}_{E_n} \int \left(\mathrm{e}^{\hat{\beta}_n' z} r_{1,n}(u) - \mathrm{e}^{\beta_0' z} r_{2,n}(u) \right) \, \mathrm{d}\sqrt{n}(\mathbb{P}_n - \mathbb{P})(u, \delta, z),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} r_{1,n}(u) &= \mathbb{1}_{\{u > x-b\}} \int_{x-b}^{u \wedge (x+b)} a_{n,x}(\hat{A}_n(v)) \, \hat{\lambda}_n(v) \, \mathrm{d}v, \\ r_{2,n}(u) &= \mathbb{1}_{\{u > x-b\}} \int_{x-b}^{u \wedge (x+b)} a_{n,x}(v) \, \lambda_0(v) \, \mathrm{d}v, \end{aligned}$$

are both monotone functions, uniformly bounded by some constant C on the event $\mathcal{A}_n^c$. Once more, from here we follow exactly the same proof as the one for Lemma A.1. □

Theorem B.11. *Fix $x \in (0, \tau_h)$. Assume that λ_0 is $m \geq 2$ times differentiable in x, such that λ_0' is uniformly bounded above and below by strictly positive constants. Moreover, that $t \mapsto \Phi(t; \beta_0)$ is differentiable with a bounded derivative in a neighborhood of x. Let k be*

m-orthogonal with support $[-1,1]$*, and suppose it is differentiable with a uniformly bounded derivative. Let* $\hat{\lambda}_n^{SM}$ *be defined in* (8) *and assume that* $n^{1/(2m+1)}b \to c > 0$*. Then, it holds*

$$n^{m/(2m+1)}\left(\hat{\lambda}_n^{SM}(x) - \lambda_0(x)\right) \xrightarrow{d} N(\mu, \sigma^2),$$

where

$$\mu = \frac{(-c)^m}{m!}\lambda_0^{(m)}(x)\int k(u)u^m \,\mathrm{d}u \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma^2 = \frac{\lambda_0(x)}{c\Phi(x;\beta_0)}\int k^2(u)\,\mathrm{d}u.$$

Proof. The proof is completely analogous to that of Theorem B.11 and is based on a similar decomposition as in (27). After using Lemmas B.1, B.2, B.8, and B.10, it remains to obtain the limit of (30), where E_n is the event from Lemma B.1. This is completely similar to the argument in the proof of Theorem 3.5. □